



JAWAHARLAL NEHRU'S SPEECHES

VOLUME THREE

March 1953 - August 1957



PUBLICATIONS DIVISION
MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

<i>First published</i>	<i>August 1958</i>	<i>(Sravana 1880)</i>
<i>Reprinted</i>	<i>October 1970</i>	<i>(Asvina 1892)</i>

Price Rs. 14.50

**PUBLISHED BY THE DIRECTOR, PUBLICATIONS DIVISION
MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA, PATIALA HOUSE, NEW DELHI-1**

Regional offices

BOTAWALA CHAMBERS, SIR PHEROZESHAH MENTA ROAD,	Bombay-1
AKASHVANI BHAVAN,	Calcutta-1
SHASTRI BHAVAN,	Madras-6

PRINTED AT SKYLARK PRINTERS, NEW DELHI-33

PREFACE

This is the third collection of the speeches of Jawaharlal Nehru as Prime Minister and covers the period from March 1953 to August 1957.

Economic development absorbed the nation's energies during this period. The First Five Year Plan was completed and the Second taken up. The goal to be realized was re-defined as a Socialist society, which, in the words of Jawaharlal Nehru, was an advance over the Welfare State ideal accepted earlier. The direction thus made clear, the emphasis was on the pace of progress. Most of the speeches here reveal the late Prime Minister's impatience with tardiness.

The second General Election was held early in 1957, which highlighted the country's faith in the democratic institutions it has chosen. Reorganization of States which was undertaken in 1956 carried the earlier process of territorial integration a stage further, and served to underline the two essentials of the democratic method: government by discussion and peaceful change through consent.

In foreign policy, India's ideas found crystallized expression in the concept of Panchsheel. Another major development of the period was the growing solidarity of the Afro-Asian peoples. The implications of India's foreign policy found wider appreciation. The country's stand on Kashmir and Goa, in particular, vindicated the determination to relate policy to principle.

Here in this volume is the story of India and the world narrated by India's most eloquent, sensitive and knowledgeable spokesman. These speeches are very much more than the utterances of the head of a government.

In addition to speeches, mostly delivered extempore, the

volume includes some prepared statements. Where the text is a translation from the original Hindi, this is indicated in the footnote.

The material has been grouped in eight sections for convenience, and the arrangement within each section is chronological.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
OUR GOALS AND METHODS	
TEMPLES OF THE NEW AGE ..	1
From a Hindi speech delivered at the opening of the Nangal Canal, July 8, 1954	
THREE HUNDRED AND SIXTY MILLION PROBLEMS ..	4
From a speech at the inaugural meeting of the Co-ordination Board of Ministers for River Valley Projects, New Delhi, October 13, 1954	
PROGRESS BY CONSENT ..	7
Speech in Lok Sabha, December 21, 1954	
THE SOCIALISTIC PATTERN ..	15
Address at the 60th session of the Indian National Congress at Avadi, January 22, 1955	
NEW DYNAMISM IN THE VILLAGES ..	21
Message to the fourth Development Commissioners' Conference held at Simla, May 9, 1955	
PLACE OF THE BIG MACHINE ..	23
Speech at the inauguration of production at the Integral Coach Factory, Perambur, Madras, October 2, 1955	
EMOTIONAL INTEGRATION- ..	27
Speech at Bangalore, October 6, 1955 ..	
OUR COMMON HERITAGE ..	36
From a speech at Trichur, December 26, 1955	
THE PLAN IS THE COUNTRY'S DEFENCE ..	38
Speech during debate on Demands of the Ministry of Defence, Lok Sabha, March 21, 1956	
NOT 'HOLIER THAN THOU' ..	44
From reply to debate on International Affairs, Lok Sabha, November 20, 1956	
THE INDIAN WAY OF LIFE ..	46
Television and radio address, Washington, U.S.A., December 18, 1956	
AWAY FROM ACQUISITIVE SOCIETY ..	51
Speech to All-India Congress Committee, Indore, January 4, 1957	
OUR MAIN FAILING ..	54
From inaugural address at the 30th annual session of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry, New Delhi, March 23, 1957	

THE PLAN AND ITS PROBLEMS

BULLOCK CART, MOTOR LORRY, JET PLANE ..	56
Address to the Associated Chambers of Commerce, Calcutta, December 14, 1953	
SIGN OF MATURITY ..	67
Press Conference, New Delhi, May 31, 1955	
CONCEPT OF LONG-TERM PLANNING ..	76
Speech at a meeting of the Standing Committee of the National Development Council, New Delhi, January 7, 1956	

	PAGE
THE PLAN AND ITS PROBLEMS (Contd.)	
OPEN-MINDED APPROACH ..	83
Address to the Conference of the All-India Manufacturers' Organization, New Delhi, April 14, 1956	
THE SECOND FIVE-YEAR PLAN ..	90
Speech initiating the debate on the Second Five-Year Plan in Lok Sabha, May 23, 1956	
PERSONNEL FOR INDUSTRY ..	106
Address to the National Council for Training in Vocational Trades, New Delhi, July 30, 1957	
THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS	
THE TWO HOUSES ..	113
Statement in the House of the People (Lok Sabha), May 6, 1953	
THE ADMINISTRATIVE JUNGLE ..	116
Inaugural address at the 24th annual meeting of the Central Board of Irrigation and Power, New Delhi, October 26, 1953	
PRIVATE PROPERTY AND PUBLIC GOOD ..	124
Speech in Lok Sabha on Bill to amend Article 31 (2) of the Constitution, April 11, 1955	
PARTIES IN INDIA ..	134
From speech at Trichur, December 26, 1955	
GOVERNMENT AND THE PEOPLE ..	137
Address to the First All-India Seminar on Parliamentary Democracy, New Delhi, February 25, 1956	
THE APPLEBY REPORT ..	145
Speech in Lok Sabha, September 10, 1956	
THE OPPOSITION ..	152
From a speech at Island Ground, Madras, January 31, 1957	
PARLIAMENTARY DEMOCRACY ..	154
Speech in Lok Sabha, March 28, 1957	
FUNCTION OF THE CIVIL SERVANT ..	158
Presidential address at the third annual meeting of the general body of the Indian Institute of Public Administration, New Delhi, April 6, 1957	
STATES' REORGANIZATION	
THE S.R.C. REPORT ..	167
Broadcast to the nation, October 9, 1955	
COEXISTENCE AT HOME ..	170
Speech during debate on the Report of the States Reorganization Commission, Lok Sabha, December 21, 1955	
APPEAL FOR GOODWILL ..	183
Broadcast from New Delhi on January 16, 1956	
GROWTH OF VIOLENCE ..	188
From reply to debate on the President's Address, Lok Sabha, February 23, 1956	
STATES AND THE NATION ..	196
Speech on the States Reorganization Bill in Lok Sabha, July 30, 1956	
A CONSIDERED DECISION ..	206
Speech during debate on the States Reorganization Bill in Rajya Sabha, New Delhi, August 23, 1956	

	Page
ON KASHMIR	
NEED FOR FRIENDLY APPROACH ..	209
Press Conference, Cairo, June 25, 1953	
CHANGE OF GOVERNMENT IN STATE ..	210
Speech in the House of the People (Lok Sabha), September 17, 1953	
KASHMIR'S ECONOMIC PROGRESS ..	215
Speech during debate on Demands of the External Affairs Ministry, Lok Sabha, March 31, 1955	
BASIC FACTS OF THE CASE ..	216
From reply to Foreign Affairs debate, Lok Sabha, March 29, 1956	
WELL-BEING OF THE PEOPLE—THE PRIMARY CONSIDERATION	227
From speech at Island Ground, Madras, January 31, 1957	
FOREIGN INTERFERENCE ..	236
From a speech during debate on Foreign Affairs, Lok Sabha, March 25, 1957	

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

A. General

THE FAR EASTERN POLITICAL CONFERENCE ..	240
From speech in the House of the People (Lok Sabha), September 17, 1953	
MISSION IN KOREA ..	244
From reply to Foreign Affairs debate, House of the People (Lok Sabha), December 24, 1953	
APPEAL FOR CEASE-FIRE IN INDO-CHINA ..	245
From reply to a debate on the President's Address, House of the People (Lok Sabha), February 22, 1954	
THE HYDROGEN BOMB ..	246
Statement in the House of the People (Lok Sabha), April 2, 1954	
THE COLOMBO POWERS' PEACE EFFORTS ..	251
Broadcast from Colombo, May 2, 1954	
CONTROL OF NUCLEAR ENERGY ..	254
Speech in the House of the People (Lok Sabha), May 10, 1954	
AGREEMENT ON TIBET ..	262
From speeches in Lok Sabha, May 15, 1954 and September 30, 1954	
THE SOUTH-EAST ASIA TREATY ORGANIZATION ..	265
Speech during Foreign Affairs debate, Lok Sabha, September 29, 1954	
THE NEW CHINA ..	273
Press conference, New Delhi, November 13, 1954	
AN INDEPENDENT APPROACH ..	280
Speech in Lok Sabha during debate on the President's Address, February 25, 1955	
ASIA AND AFRICA AWAKE ..	288
Speech at the concluding session of the Asian-African Conference at Bandung, Indonesia, April 24, 1955	
REPORT ON BANDUNG ..	292
Statement in Lok Sabha, April 30, 1955	
VISIT TO RUSSIA ..	301
Statement at the Dynamo Stadium, Moscow, June 22, 1955	

	PAGE
FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Contd.)	
THE CONCEPT OF PANCHSHEEL ..	306
From a speech in Lok Sabha, September 17, 1955	
GUESTS FROM MOSCOW ..	308
Substance of a speech in Hindi at Banquet in honour of Mr. Bulganin and Mr. Khrushchev at Rashtrapati Bhavan, November 20, 1955	
COMMONWEALTH CITIZENSHIP ..	311
Speech in Lok Sabha on the Citizenship Bill, December 5, 1955	
NEW TRENDS IN RUSSIA ..	318
From a statement in Lok Sabha, March 20, 1956	
THE BAGHDAD PACT ..	319
From a speech in Lok Sabha, March 29, 1956	
EVENTS IN HUNGARY AND EGYPT ..	321
Speech in Lok Sabha during debate on Foreign Affairs, November 19, 1956	
FOREIGN TROOPS IN HUNGARY ..	334
Speech in Rajya Sabha, December 13, 1956	
INDEPENDENCE OF GHANA ..	340
Speech at a meeting organized by the African Students' Association (India) in Delhi, March 6, 1957	
POWER VACUUM THEORY ..	342
From a speech during debate on Foreign Affairs, Lok Sabha, March 25, 1957	
B. Our Neighbours	
MILITARY AID TO PAKISTAN ..	344
Reply to debate on the President's Address, House of the People (Lok Sabha), February 22, 1954	
THE CANAL WATERS DISPUTE ..	346
From speech in Hindi on the occasion of the opening of the Nangal Canal, July 8, 1954	
OFFER TO PAKISTAN ..	354
From a statement in Lok Sabha, March 20, 1956	
EAST BENGAL EXODUS ..	356
From a speech in Lok Sabha, March 29, 1956	
HARM OF TWO-NATION THEORY ..	358
Reply to debate on the President's Address, Lok Sabha, March 21, 1957	
PEOPLE OF INDIAN DESCENT IN CEYLON ..	365
From speeches in Lok Sabha, May 15, 1954 and September 30, 1954 and in Rajya Sabha, September 6, 1955	
C. The Problem of Goa	
FUTURE STATUS OF AREA ..	372
Statement in Lok Sabha, August 25, 1954	
FOREIGN FOOTHOLDS ..	377
Reply to debate on Goa in Lok Sabha, July 26, 1955	
NO CHANGE OF BASIC POLICY ..	385
From speeches in Lok Sabha, September 17, 1955	

	PAGE
ON EDUCATION AND CULTURE	
ENRICHING THE LANGUAGES	393
Speech at a meeting of the Congress Party in Parliament, New Delhi, May 7, 1954	
TRAINING THE MOTHER	398
Speech at the laying of the foundation tablet of a women's college at Teynampet, Madras, January 22, 1955	
BASIC EDUCATION	402
Address at the Avadi Session of the Indian National Congress, January 23, 1955	
FILMS FOR THE PEOPLE	407
Speech inaugurating the Film Seminar, New Delhi, February 27, 1955	
CRISIS OF THE SPIRIT	412
Foreword in Hindi to <i>Sanskriti Ke Char Adhyaya</i> by Ramdhari Sinha 'Dinkar', September 30, 1955	
THE SANSKRIT LANGUAGE	418
Speech at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, August 1, 1956	
THE PLACE OF ENGLISH	422
A statement, September 8, 1956	
BUDDHA'S TEACHING TODAY	426
Valedictory address at the Seminar on Buddhism's contribution to Art, Letters and Philosophy, New Delhi, November 29, 1956	
SCIENCE AND HUMILITY	432
Speech at the Science Congress, Calcutta, January 14, 1957	
A FAITH THROUGH LIFE	435
Address at the Visva-Bharati Samavartana, Santiniketan, January 15, 1957	

MISCELLANEOUS

CHANGING HINDU SOCIETY:	
i. <i>Special Marriage Bill</i>	440
Speech in Lok Sabha during the debate on the Special Marriage Bill, May 22, 1954	
ii. <i>The Divorce Clause</i>	443
Speech in Lok Sabha on the Divorce Clause of the Special Marriage Bill, September 16, 1954	
iii. <i>The Hindu Marriage Bill</i>	446
Speech during debate on the Third Reading of the Hindu Marriage Bill in Lok Sabha, May 5, 1955	
TASKS FOR THE PRESS	454
From an address to the eleventh session of the All-India Newspaper Editors' Conference, New Delhi, August 13, 1954	
APPROACH TO THE TRIBES	458
Inaugural address at the Tribal Affairs Conference, New Delhi, December 4, 1954	
PLACE OF PONDICHERRY	461
Speech at a reception in Pondicherry, January 16, 1955	
ON BUILDING A BEAUTIFUL CITY	465
Speech at the laying of the foundation stone of the new Corporation building at Bangalore, October 6, 1955	

	PAGE
MISCELLANEOUS (Contd.)	
ON TRAVEL AND TOURISM	.. 468
Speech inaugurating the 10th General Assembly session of the International Union of Official Travel Organizations, New Delhi, October 19, 1955	
OPPORTUNITY FOR YOUTH	.. 472
Address at the second Inter-University Youth Festival, New Delhi, October 23, 1955	
TWO FRIENDS OF INDIA	.. 477
Speech at Banquet for the Earl and Countess Mountbatten, New Delhi, March 15, 1956	
PROFILE OF A FIGHTER	.. 480
Interview by K. G. Saiyidain on All India Radio, May, 6, 1956	
ANCIENT AND MODERN MEDICINE	.. 483
Address at a special convocation of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, Bombay, June 1, 1956	
TRIBUTE TO TILAK	.. 486
Speech while unveiling a portrait of Lokmanya Tilak in the Central Hall of Parliament, July 28, 1956	
THE NAGAS	.. 490
Speech in Lok Sabha, New Delhi, during debate on the Naga Hills situation, August 23, 1956	
TRUE WAY TO PEACE	.. 499
Speech at the inauguration of the tenth annual session of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), New Delhi, November 5, 1956	
APSARA	.. 504
Speech at the inauguration of the SwimmingPool Reactor at Trombay, January 20, 1957	
EFFECTIVE INTERNATIONAL LAW	.. 508
Speech at the Asian Legal Consultative Committee meeting, New Delhi, April 18, 1957	
OUR ATOMIC ENERGY RESOURCES	.. 513
Reply to debate on demands of the Atomic Energy Department, Lok Sabha, July 24, 1957	

OUR GOALS AND METHODS

TEMPLES OF THE NEW AGE

I HAVE OCCASION frequently these days to participate in functions marking the inauguration of some new work or completion of some other. Today, you and I and all these persons have gathered here on one such occasion. I want to know from you what you think and feel in your minds and hearts on this occasion, because in my heart and mind there is a strange exhilaration and excitement, and many kinds of pictures come before me. Many dreams we have dreamt are today drawing near and being materialized. For the materialization of these dreams, we may praise one another, and those who have done good work should be praised. But how many can be praised when the list runs to thousands, nay, lakhs?

Let us give praise where it is due. The work which we see today, and in the inauguration of which we are participating, is much bigger than our individual selves. It is a tremendous thing. I have told you that I, and undoubtedly many of you, have frequent occasion to participate in various functions. A foundation stone is laid somewhere; a building, a hospital, a school or a university is opened elsewhere. Big factories are going up. Such activity is taking place all over the country because Mother India is producing various kinds of things. Among them, Bhakra-Nangal has a special place—Bhakra-Nangal where a small village stood, but which today is a name ringing in every corner of India and in some parts of the world too; because this is a great work, the mark of a great enterprise.

About fifty years ago, an Englishman came here and for the first time had the idea that something could be done at this place, but the idea did not materialize. The matter was raised

From a Hindi speech delivered at the opening of the Nangal Canal, July 8, 1954

many times. Some rough plans were made but they were not pursued. Then India became free. In the process, the Punjab suffered a great shock and a grievous wound. But despite the shock and the wound, freedom brought a new strength, a new enthusiasm. And so with the wound, the worries and calamities, came this new enthusiasm and new strength to take up this big work. And we took it up. I have come here frequently. Many of you also must have come and seen this slowly changing picture and felt something stirring deep within you. What a stupendous, magnificent work—a work which only that nation can take up which has faith and boldness! This is a work which does not belong only to the Punjab, or PEPSU or the neighbouring States, but to the whole of India.

India has undertaken other big works which are not much smaller than this. Damodar Valley, Hirakud and the big projects of the South are going on apace. Plans are being made every day because we are anxious to build a new India as speedily as possible, to lead it forward, to make it strong and to remove the poverty of its people. We are doing all this, and Bhakra-Nangal in many respects will be one of the greatest of these works, because a very big step in this direction is being taken here today after years of endeavour. Every work we complete in India gives fresh strength to the nation to undertake new tasks. Bhakra-Nangal is a landmark not merely because the water will flow here and irrigate large portions of the Punjab, PEPSU, Rajasthan and fertilize the deserts of Rajasthan, or because enough electric power will be generated here to run thousands of factories and cottage industries which will provide work for the people and relieve unemployment. It is a landmark because it has become the symbol of a nation's will to march forward with strength, determination and courage. That is why, seeing this work, my courage and strength have increased, because nothing is more encouraging than to capture our dreams and give them real shape.

Just before coming to Nangal, I was in Bhakra where the Dam is being built. I stood on the banks of the Sutlej and saw the mountains to the right and left. Far away, at various spots, people were working. Since it was a holiday, there was

not much work going on, for all the people had come here. Still there were a few persons working. From a distance they looked very small against the mighty-looking mountain through which a tunnel was being bored. The thought came to me that it was these very men who had striven against the mountains and brought them under control.

What is now complete is only half the work. We may celebrate its completion but we must remember that the most difficult part still remains to be done—the construction of the Dam about which you have heard so much. Our engineers tell us that probably nowhere else in the world is there a dam as high as this. The work bristles with difficulties and complications. As I walked round the site I thought that these days the biggest temple and mosque and gurdwara is the place where man works for the good of mankind. Which place can be greater than this, this Bhakra-Nangal, where thousands and lakhs of men have worked, have shed their blood and sweat and laid down their lives as well? Where can be a greater and holier place than this, which we can regard as higher?

Then again it struck me that Bhakra-Nangal was like a big university where we can work and while working learn, so that we may do bigger things. The nation is marching forward and every day the pace becomes faster. As we learn the work and gain experience, we advance with greater speed. Bhakra-Nangal is not a work of this moment only, because the work which we are doing at present is not only for our own times but for coming generations and future times.

Another thought came to my mind when I saw the Sutlej. Where has it come from? What course has it traversed to reach here? Do you know where the Sutlej springs from? It rises near Mount Kailash in the vicinity of Mansarovar. The Indus rises near by. The Brahmaputra also flows from that place in a different direction, reaching India and Pakistan after traversing thousands of miles. Other rivers rise from places near by and flow from Tibet towards China. So the Sutlej traverses hundreds of miles through the Himalayas to reach here and we have tried to control her in a friendly way. You have seen the two big diversion channels. At present the whole river has been channelled through one canal. After the

rains we will divert the river completely in the two channels so that the dam might be built there.

I look far, not only towards Bhakra-Nangal, but towards this our country, India, whose children we are. Where is she going? Where have we to lead her, which way have we to walk and what mighty tasks have we to undertake? Some of these will be completed in our lifetime. Others will be taken up and completed by those who come after us. The work of a nation or a country is never completed. It goes on and no one can arrest its progress—the progress of a living nation. We have to press forward. The question is which way we have to take, how we should proceed, what principles, what objectives we have to keep before us. All these big questions crop up. This is not an occasion to tell you about them but we have to remember them always and not forget them. When we undertake a big work we have to do so with a large heart and a large mind. Small minds or small-minded nations cannot undertake big works. When we see big works our stature grows with them, and our minds open out a little.

THREE HUNDRED AND SIXTY MILLION PROBLEMS

ONCE I WAS ASKED, "What is your principal problem? How many problems have you got?" I said, "We have got 360 million problems in India." Now that answer amused people, but it has an essential truth in it : that all our problems have to be viewed from the point of view of the 360 million individuals, not some statistical mass which you see drawn in curves and graphs on paper. Graphs are very useful to understand, but we must think in terms of individuals, individual happiness and individual misery.

We are starting planning for the 360 million human beings in India. We may sit down and argue about the theoretical

From a speech at the inaugural meeting of the Co-ordination Board of Ministers for River Valley Projects, New Delhi, October 13, 1954

approaches. We may argue about, let us say, whether we should have a socialistic approach or a private enterprise approach or a communistic approach or a Gandhian approach. We may go on listing any number of approaches; and it is interesting to argue and to clarify our minds, because thinking is helped by the sharp exchange of ideas. But, unfortunately, all these words which at one time had some precise meaning have gradually tended to become debased and to lose their meaning by association with hosts of new ideas, new conflicts, new passions.

Words are tricky things always. In the final analysis the word is the biggest thing in the world. All the knowledge we have, everything we possess, is a collection of words which represent ideas of course. A simple word like table or chair, if it is simply that, the matter ends there; but as soon as we get out of that category of tables and chairs and get to concepts which have emotional significance attached to them, they become very tricky. When we think of such words we get roused up; a certain emotion fills us. An emotion may fill us with enthusiasm but we cease to think straight. And when two persons meet whose emotions have been roused up in different ways by the same word, then it becomes quite impossible for them to have any reasonable discussion. In the international sphere today, there is so much emotion, passion and anger roused by words, and what the words are supposed to connote, that it is becoming very difficult to have consistent or reasonable discussion. Words are thrown at each other just as a bomb might be thrown at a person. Therefore I say: Beware of words, great as they are. What do we want? Not words, even though words may signify much.

What do the 360 million people want? It is fairly easy to begin making a list—later there may be differences of opinion—but it is obvious enough that they want food; it is obvious enough that they want clothing, that they want shelter, that they want health. They want such things, regardless of the social or economic policies we may have in mind. I suggest that the only policy that we should have in mind is that we have to work for the 360 million people; not for a few,

not for a group but the whole lot, and to bring them up on an equal basis.

We are now at a stage when we can go forward in our journey with greater assurance. We have to utilize the experience we have gained, pool our resources and prevent wastage. We cannot allow the nation's resources to be wasted. Democracy has many virtues, but one of its concomitants is wastage of time and energy. Nevertheless, for many reasons, we prefer democracy to other methods of government. That does not mean that we cannot avoid waste. We cannot afford waste, because the basic thing is that we should go ahead. The devil is at our heels, or as they say, *Shaitan peecheh ata hai, to bhagte hain*. I should like you to have this kind of feeling. To hell with the man who cannot walk fast. It serves him right if he gets out of the ranks and falls out. We want no sluggards. We want no slow people who always complain about their service conditions and their transfers and so on. I am fed up with such complaints. Service conditions and salary and status may be important. But I want work and work and work. I want achievement. I want men who work as crusaders. I want men who are going to fight for what they think is right and not submit humbly to wrong. I want you to do big things. I want you to build up India. Can you conceive of a bigger thing than to build up this immense country of ours? That is the spirit in which you have to undertake this job. And let the weak and the slow and lazy go to the wall. There should be no pity for them.

We have many critics. It is essential that we should have critics, because otherwise we tend to grow complacent and lazy in our thinking and in our action. But it is not fair or helpful for critics not to see things as a whole. Let them do so and then point out the many failings we suffer from. Let them see what we do, and feel with conviction what we do. What we are doing in India is something very worthwhile, something to be proud of, something worthy to be compared with the work in any other part of the world, given of course comparable conditions. You cannot certainly compare something happening in India with anything happening in the United States of America in the course of a year. They can get their

steel production up to any number of million tons, if they want to, while we struggle and struggle because the conditions here are different. We have, first of all, to see this picture, the objective, the big tasks that we have undertaken and feel a sense of achievement. Shall I say that by the bigness of the task that we have undertaken we become big ourselves? A person grows by his thoughts, by his actions, by his objectives. We are, as the Buddhist *Dharmapada* has said, just a collection, a layer upon layer, of our thoughts. So, if we think in a big way and act in a big way, we tend to become big ourselves, as individuals and as a nation.

I wish you all success in the work you are beginning, and I hope particularly that you will look upon it as what it is, an amazing adventure in doing big things. Thereby you can, to some extent, change the face of India and go a few steps towards the realization of our goal, which is the welfare and advancement of India's three hundred and sixty millions.

PROGRESS BY CONSENT

IF WE TRAVEL all over India we see an enormous variety of population in various degrees of development. We see many cultural, political, social and economic disparities. We want to put an end to these disparities and inequalities.

But remember, there is a limit to the amount of compulsion that we can exercise, apart from the desirability of compulsion. We have to go by consent, not everybody's consent, but the consent of the community as a whole. Apart from this ineluctable factor, so far as our country is concerned, we have followed a policy in our political field which is somewhat unique. In our political struggle, by and large, we have adopted peaceful methods.

An example is the way we put an end to the princely order in this country. We paid for it. But remember this : what we

paid for it, however heavy, was very little compared with the cost of a conflict. In the economic field, similarly, we want to do away with classes, but by the method of winning over people. I admit class struggle, but I do not want to aggravate it. I do not want to be obsessed with it. I want to get rid of it as far as possible without aggravating the struggle.

I dislike comparing my country with others to our advantage or disadvantage, because I do not want to criticize other countries. But I venture to point out that where upheavals occur, they are products of history, and the violence, defeat and civil war govern the subsequent events. Some hon. Members seem to think that in order to have progress, they must destroy. They think that by increasing the conflict and bitterness they can have a clean slate to write upon. No country has ever had a clean slate to write upon, not even after the biggest of revolutions. No one should deliberately destroy something which is worthwhile in order to build something which may be good in certain circumstances. I am prepared to compare what has been done in India in the last few years with what has been achieved in any other country. We may have achieved less; I am prepared to admit that. But we must take into account the peaceful and co-operative method of our approach. You may say that even taking this peaceful, co-operative method of approach we might have gone faster. But the House must be clear whether we want the peaceful, co-operative and democratic method or whether we want some other method.

The word democracy, I know, can mean many things, but I am talking of what is called parliamentary democracy. There are other methods which may equally be democratic but which are different. Why have we chosen parliamentary democracy? Because we think that in the long run it produces the best results. If we come to the conclusion that it does not produce the best results, well, we change it, obviously because we want results. What are the results we are aiming at? National well-being, and the happiness of the millions and millions of our people. We have, at the present moment, a country which is industrially not developed, although we are industrially more developed than any other country in Asia,

apart from Japan. I am not at the moment taking into consideration the Soviet regions of Asia. Apart from these two exceptions, India is industrially better developed than any country, certainly more than China. Nevertheless, we are an undeveloped country. Our standard of living is low. We have got to raise that, and in raising that we have got to find employment for all our people. What are our objectives? We may define them in many ways, but perhaps one way which is more important than others is to find progressively fuller employment till we reach full employment through increased production. You may also say that greater production ought to imply better distribution.

If that is our approach, how are we to do it in this very complicated situation that we are in, with an under-developed economy and with very little surplus to invest? We cannot compare our problems with those of the industrialized West, because they have had centuries, or at any rate, generations of growth. We cannot compare ourselves with Soviet Russia. The only country which, in a sense, is comparable is China, which also has a vast population, unemployment, very low standards and under-development of industries. Therefore, it is conceivable that as they achieve progress according to their ways, we may be able to learn something from them. But China has passed through forty years of civil war and international war. We had, fortunately, a peaceful transfer of power in this country, with a running machine. A running machine has its advantages and disadvantages. I prefer the advantages. The disadvantage may be that you are tied up with certain processes which take time to change. The advantages are obvious—that you do not destroy and start from scratch. We started at a higher level, as I said, compared to most countries in Asia. Although at present the industrial conditions in India are better, it does not mean that China may not make greater progress. That is a different matter. But is there any comparison between the stability—political, economic and social—that we have achieved in this country and the progress we are making, and the conditions in other countries? It may be slow, but there is no doubt about our progress and the impression we have made in the wide world.

It is an extraordinary thing that our critics abroad come from certain very reactionary parties in the West who do not like India's progress. We have also critics among our own countrymen. Let us have criticism galore, but let us always remember that if India is going ahead, it is not because the Government of India is very bright but because the people of India function.

It is not right for us always to be running down what the people of India are doing. Take the Community Projects or the National Extension Service. I think it is one of the biggest things that any country has undertaken, and I think that it is succeeding in a very large measure. It is an amazing thing how we are building it up from the grass-roots, and not imposing it from above.

And what has been the reaction of many of our friends on the opposite benches? They not only refuse to co-operate with it, but they run it down. They forget that it is not a governmental effort, but the people's effort. They keep away and they keep others away. In fact, they obstruct the progress that might be made.

Professor Meghnad Saha has said that all the figures that the Finance Minister has given about the industrial and other progress that we have made were completely wrong. It is difficult for me in a short space of time to go into these detailed figures. Most of the figures, hon. Members know, have been given in the Planning Commission's progress report and other papers. But I really am surprised at Professor Saha challenging figures which are obviously right.

The index of industrial production (which was 100 in 1946) rose from 105 in 1950 to 111 in 1953. In July this year it was 149. It is a big jump from 105 to 149. There has thus been an increase of over 33 per cent since 1953. It is a very good increase. Shri Asoka Mehta spoke about its being lop-sided. But let us remove the lop-sidedness. It is true, of course, that judged in terms of our needs and what we should do, this increase is not enough. We admit that. But the point is that there has been a marked increase in industrial production, whether it is output of cloth by 25 per cent or cement by 50 per cent; and Sindri has reached capacity production and we

are now on the verge of starting one or two more Sindris. I agree, of course, there is no question of Government feeling complacent. We are not complacent, but what I do say is that we are not frightened by the problem. We are going to face it and solve it. I am talking of all of us together and the country. The slightest weakening, the slightest element of complacency, will come in our way.

We started planning, as the House will remember, three years or four years ago, with very little data. It is very difficult to plan without data. Gradually, we have collected data. Gradually, we have made the States and the people in the States plan-conscious. All the time, we have had to face the terrific problem of food shortage in this country. We came to the conclusion, rightly or wrongly, that in the First Five-Year Plan, the most important thing was the agricultural front. Of course, we are carrying on with the river valley schemes, and we have put up the Sindri and Chittaranjan factories and many other kinds of plants. But, essentially, we realized that food shortage was the big problem and we concentrated on that. We did that because we felt that unless we had a strong food basis, our industrial efforts might well be bogged down.

Hon. Members who have studied the history of other countries probably know that too much stress on heavy industries has produced difficult problems in those countries. In fact, the price paid for rapid industrialization has been terrific in some socialistic countries. I am certain that no country with any kind of parliamentary democracy can possibly pay it. Maybe, where there is a dictatorship with an army behind it, they may be able to do it. But even a dictator cannot go too far without the consent of the people. Real progress must ultimately depend on industrialization. That industrialization ultimately depends on heavy industries. Even to preserve our national independence, and, much more, to raise our standards of living, heavy industries are essential. But if we go in for heavy industries alone and not think of the other factors, it is quite possible that our problems will become much more difficult. It is possible also that unemployment will grow. We have to face the problems

which China has to face. Of course, we hear many kinds of reports about China. There are good accounts and true accounts. There is terrific unemployment in China. Their own leader says so. They are trying to face it, perhaps in a different way. The same problem comes up before us. We want higher techniques. We cannot progress without higher techniques. But the moment we think of higher techniques, we cause unemployment. We do not want unemployment; we want more employment.

People talk about the public sector and the private sector. Does the House realize that the biggest and the overwhelming part of the private sector is the private sector of the peasants in India? That is the real private sector in our country, not the few factories we have.

There is much discussion about the public sector and the private sector. I said the other day—and have said it more than once—that I attach great importance to the public sector. The pattern of society that we look forward to is a socialist pattern of society which is classless, casteless. So far as the Congress is concerned, for a long time past, it has laid down its objective as a casteless, classless society, which, obviously, can be attained only in a socialistic pattern. But I would beg of you not to imagine that because socialism conceives of nationalized industry, therefore you must have all industry nationalized. I think that as the socialist pattern grows, there is bound to be more and more nationalized industry, but what is important is not that there should be an attempt to nationalize everything, but that we should aim at the ultimate result, which is higher production and employment. If by taking any step you actually hinder the process of production and employment from growing, then that does not lead you to the socialistic pattern. In a country like India, where money, trained personnel and experience are lacking, we have to take advantage of such experience, training and money as we have. We want to make this business of building up India a co-operative enterprise of all the people. We try to avoid conflicts and try to avoid taking steps which have a chilling effect on this pattern. We want to go ahead in regard to production and employment. That is

the vital thing. And in order to attain that, we have to create the right atmosphere and encourage initiative.

In regard to the public and the private sector, it is obvious that with the limited resources we have in the hands of the State, we cannot do all that we want to do at the present moment. We shall, of course, try to do as much as we can. But some people suggest that we must prevent the private sector from functioning in the field of industries. I think such an idea comes from confused thinking. I do not understand this attitude. I want a socialist society in India. I want to get out of this framework of an acquisitive society, but I am not going to get it by merely passing resolutions and raising slogans. I want India to move in that direction, carrying a large number of people with it.

It is obvious there is no question of seeking everybody's consent. We do not especially go and seek the consent of the landlords before we have land legislation. Nevertheless, we have land legislation in a way so as not to throw the landlords to the wolves. That is, we try to fit them into our future structure. As a matter of fact, hon. Members might know that hundreds of thousands of landlords in U.P. have been badly hit by the land legislation; but we have not made them enemies. The other approach is to make people your enemies, call them names, and, instead of getting help from them, actually get obstruction.

Some people might talk about private enterprise and *laissez faire*, but practically nobody now believes in *laissez faire*. There is regulation and control all over the world in regard to industry and imports and exports. Everywhere, even in the most highly developed countries of the capitalist economy, the State functions in a way which possibly a socialist fifty years ago did not dream of. I am not saying that we should follow a slow course. Let us go swiftly and definitely in the direction of a socialistic economy, but let us go in a balanced way. Let us get as much help as we can. I do not see any harm at all—in fact I see a lot of good—in the private sector functioning.

But it is obvious, in a country as undeveloped as ours, that we cannot progress except by State initiative, except by enlarging the public sector, and except by controlling the

private sector at important points. I cannot obviously go into the question of where the line should be drawn. But the line will ever be a changing one, because the public sector will be a growing one. The important thing is that the strategic points must be controlled by the State. Having said that, I shall add : if you leave something to the private sector, give them freedom to function within those strategic controls; it is absurd to ask them to function, denying them room to function, denying them the initiative. We have the private sector because we think they will add to our common good. And if we deny them any initiative in the sphere demarcated for them, then they become useless and helpless; it is better to take the whole thing into the public sector.

If I may repeat, our policy must inevitably be one of raising production and increasing employment as rapidly as possible. In doing that, it is essential that the public sector should grow as rapidly as possible. I think that under the present circumstances in India, it is very necessary that the private sector should function under certain broad strategic controls, but, otherwise, with freedom and with initiative. The private sector is a part of the Plan, a co-ordinated part; this is where the strategic controls come in. I do not want to limit the public sector at all anywhere. But our resources are limited. It is no good my preventing somebody else from doing something which I cannot do myself; that is folly, because thereby we lose something which might be created.

The Finance Minister calls this a pragmatic approach. It is pragmatic in the sense that the pragmatic approach itself looks in a certain direction and has certain objectives. Otherwise, it is based on an objective consideration of things as they are.

THE SOCIALISTIC PATTERN

YESTERDAY I had the honour to present a resolution before you, which you passed. In it we stated that we wanted it to be clearly understood that we aim at a socialistic pattern of society. In the present resolution which deals with the economic policy, we have to give effect to that decision of yours, because ultimately it is the economic policy which is going to shape that picture of India which you call the 'socialistic pattern'. This resolution is therefore of the highest importance.

In a resolution of this kind, however long-drawn-out it might be, one cannot enter into the details of policies. There is a danger in such resolutions, and that is that you may use striking words and vague phrases and imagine that you have given a great lead to the country. That does not help us, because we have to grapple with the problems of India. How to deal with those problems is itself a problem. The problems of unemployment and of raising the level of our people are not solved by broad decisions or slogans. I say this without any disrespect to those who wield striking words, because I myself have been a wielder of words all my life, drafting resolutions, getting them passed and so on. But a time comes when you have to forget words and deal with hard actualities. This applies more especially to Congressmen because they have much more responsibility than others in running the Government and deciding the Government's policy. For us merely to write resolutions is not good enough. What, then, must we do? The only thing to be done is to sit down and draw up a plan, a detailed plan. That is the function of the Planning Commission and of the Government and of those whom they consult. Obviously, a Congress session cannot sit down and draw up a five-year plan. But in a resolution of this kind we have to indicate the type of thinking needed in drawing up that plan.

This resolution contains a brief reference to the objective to be achieved. First of all, after expressing appreciation

Address at the 60th session of the Indian National Congress at Avadi, January 22, 1955

of what has been done, the resolution says that the time has now come for substantially increasing production, for raising the standards of living and for having progressively fuller employment so as to achieve full employment within a period of ten years. The first thing to note about this resolution is that it does not merely repeat what we have said before. It points out that the time has come for us to advance on the economic and social plane. In a sense we have been doing it, but we have not been doing it adequately. The time has come to put an end to unemployment in ten years. By ten years we mean two Five-Year Plan periods. I wish you to appreciate that we try not to word our resolution in what might be called bombastic language. We are an old and mature organization with a great deal of experience. It is not desirable, therefore, that we should use words which are vague or bombastic. On the whole we understate what we propose to do. If we really give effect to this resolution it means bringing about a revolution in this country, an economic revolution bigger than any that has taken place in our times. Take the simple fact of putting an end to unemployment within ten years. Just try to think what it means in this country with its population growing year by year. It is a terrific job, the like of which has not been done in these circumstances in any other country.

Yesterday, we had the President of Yugoslavia here. It was a great privilege to have had amidst us such a great revolutionary, soldier of freedom and builder. Whatever Yugoslavia's troubles, unemployment has never been one of them. In fact, they are short of human beings to do their work. For us to compare ourselves with Yugoslavia in the matter of unemployment will not therefore lead us anywhere. Take the Soviet Union—a great big country, four or five times the size of India, with a population which is only about one-third of India's. The problem is different for them—a vast area with a small population. Our problem is different—a big country, heavily populated, and under-developed. Similarly, we cannot compare our problems with those of America, England and Western Europe where they have had two hundred years of industrial growth. These comparisons may sometimes be helpful but they mislead. We have to understand our problem

as it is in India, no doubt learning from what has been done in America, England, Yugoslavia, Russia or China, but at the same time bearing in mind that the conditions in India are special and particular. Further, we have also to understand that our background is in many ways peculiar, particularly the Gandhian background.

We talk about planning. As you all know, planning is essential, and without it there would be anarchy in our economic development. About five years ago, planning was not acceptable to many people in high places but today it has come to be recognized as essential even by the man in the street. Our First Five-Year Plan is now about three years old, and we are now thinking about our Second Five-Year Plan. A phrase in this resolution says that the Second Five-Year Plan must keep the national aims of a Welfare State and a socialistic economy before it. These can only be achieved by a considerable increase in national income, and our economic policy must, therefore, aim at plenty and equitable distribution. The Second Five-Year Plan must keep these objectives in view and should be based on the physical needs of the people. These are really the important and governing words of the resolution and ought to be the controlling factors in drawing up the Second Five-Year Plan. Before going on to other aspects of the question may I say that a Welfare State and a socialistic pattern of economy are not synonymous expressions? It is true that a socialistic economy must provide for a Welfare State but it does not necessarily follow that a Welfare State must also be based on a socialistic pattern of society. Therefore the two, although they overlap, are yet somewhat different, and we say that we want both. We cannot have a Welfare State in India with all the socialism or even communism in the world unless our national income goes up greatly. Socialism or communism might help you to divide your existing wealth, if you like, but in India, there is no existing wealth for you to divide; there is only poverty to divide. It is not a question of distributing the wealth of the few rich men here and there. That is not going to make any difference in our national income. We might adopt that course for the psychological good that might come out of it. But from the

practical point of view, there is not much to divide in India because we are a poor country. We must produce wealth, and then divide it equitably. How can we have a Welfare State without wealth? Wealth need not mean gold and silver but wealth in goods and services. Our economic policy must therefore aim at plenty. Until very recently economic policies have often been based on scarcity. But the economics of scarcity has no meaning in the world of today.

Now I come to this governing clause which I just referred to with regard to the Second Five-Year Plan, namely, that the Second Five-Year Plan should be based on the physical needs of the people. You will remember that yesterday the President also emphasized the necessity for basing planning on the people's physical needs. Our First Five-Year Plan was based on the data and the material we had at our disposal as well as on things that were actually being done at the time. Take these big river valley schemes. All these things were being done at the time and we had no choice but to continue them. We had to accept what had been done. Of course, we added one or two new schemes and rearranged the priorities. That is to say, our Plan was largely based on the finances available and consisted in taking up those schemes which were most useful. But it was limited planning, not planning in the real sense of the word. The conception of planning today is not to think of the money we have and then to divide it up in the various schemes but to measure the physical needs, that is to say, how much of food the people want, how much of clothes they want, how much of housing they want, how much of education they want, how much of health services they want, how much of work and employment they want, and so on. We calculate all these and then decide what everyone in India should have of these things. Once we do that, we can set about increasing production and fulfilling these needs. It is not a simple matter because in calculating the needs of the people, we have to calculate on the basis not only of an increasing population but of increasing needs. I shall give you an instance. Let us take sugar. Our people now consume much more sugar than they used to, with the result that our calculations about sugar production went wrong.

Now, why do they eat more sugar? Evidently because they are better off. If a man getting a hundred rupees finds his income increased to a hundred and fifty, he will eat more sugar, buy more cloth, and so on. Therefore, in making calculations, we have to keep in mind that the extra money that goes into circulation because of the higher salaries and wages, affects consumption. So we find out what in five years' time will be the needs of our people, including even items needed by our Defence Services. Then we decide how to produce those things in India. In order to meet a particular variety of needs we have now to put up a factory which will produce the goods that we need five years hence. Thus, planning is a much more complicated process than merely drawing up some schemes and fixing a system of priorities.

Behind all this is another factor—finance. Finance is important but not so important as people think. What is really important is drawing up the physical needs of the people and then working to produce things which will fulfil such needs. If you are producing wealth, it does not matter very much if you have some deficit financing because you are actually putting money back through goods and services. Therefore it does not matter how you manipulate your currency so long as your production is also keeping pace with it. Of course there is the fear of inflation. We must avoid it. But there is no such fear at present in India. On the other hand, there is deflation. Nevertheless, we have to guard against inflation. We have to produce the equivalent of the money pumped in. Sometimes there is a gap between investment and production, when inflation sets in. For example, let us say we put in a hundred crores of rupees in a river valley scheme which takes seven or eight years to build. During the years it is being built we get nothing out of it but expenditure. This can be balanced in cottage industries, in which the gap in time is not large. The additional money that you have put in is not locked up for long. Therefore in planning we have to balance heavy industry, light industry, village industry and cottage industry. We want heavy industry because without it we can never really be an independent country. Light industry too has become essential for us. So has cottage

industry. I am putting forward this argument not from the Gandhian ideal, but because it is essential in order to balance heavy industry and to prevent the big gap between the pumping in of money and production.

But production is not all. A man works and produces something because he expects others to consume what he produces. If there is no consumption, he stops production. Therefore whether it is a factory or a cottage unit, consumption of what is produced should be taken care of. Mass production inevitably involves mass consumption, which in turn involves many other factors, chiefly the purchasing power of the consumer. Therefore planning must take note of the need to provide more purchasing power by way of wages, salaries and so on. Enough money should be thrown in to provide this purchasing power and to complete the circle of production and consumption. You will then produce more and consume more, and as a result your standard of living will go up.

I have ventured to take up your time in order to give you some idea of the approach that is intended in this resolution when we say that the Second Five-Year Plan should be based on the physical needs of the people. I hope it has helped you to understand the way we are thinking. I myself do not see any other way of rapid progress. The financial approach to planning is not rapid enough. I should like you to explain this to people when you go home to your respective towns and districts. We are responsible for giving effect to this resolution. We have to fulfil our promise.

NEW DYNAMISM IN THE VILLAGES

THREE YEARS AGO I inaugurated the first conference of Development Commissioners for Community Projects. I spoke bravely then of the great task ahead. None of us knew at the time how this new adventure would shape itself and what results it would bring.

Now, three years later, the fourth conference of Development Commissioners is meeting to review their work and to plan for the future. Last year at Ootacamund, after considering the work done during two years, they decided to increase the pace and to spread out this network of Community Projects and the National Extension Service all over India. They laid down as their objective that they would cover the whole of India by the end of the Second Five-Year Plan. This was a very brave decision, but I take it that the men who came to this decision did so realistically and knowing fully the nature of the task. They were, in fact, men who were themselves shouldering the burden of this vast scheme and were, therefore, talking with full knowledge of both the success obtained and the problems and difficulties ahead.

They are now meeting on the eve of our drawing up the Second Five-Year Plan. Within six months' time from now we hope to present a draft of this Plan and within less than a year the Plan should be finalized and should begin functioning. I say finalized, but there can be no finality or rigidity about such a plan. It must be flexible and capable of change and improvement as fresh experience is gathered. But some targets have to be kept in view and worked up to. There are obvious limiting factors and we cannot merely translate into the words and phrases of our Plan our hopes and aspirations. While we should be idealistic, we have to be realists also. We have to calculate our resources. These resources can partly be calculated in terms of past experience and partly in other and more uncertain terms. If our progress is to be faster than in the past, as we wish it should be, then a mere projection of the past is not adequate. The future must necessarily excel the past.

Message to the fourth Development Commissioners' Conference held at Simla, May 9, 1955

Resources are of many kinds—in money, in labour, in human beings properly attuned to the task before them. This last is a very flexible and uncertain factor. It may, under fortunate circumstances, exceed any estimate that we can make of it; it may also belie our expectations.

But we have now a certain experience to guide us and this experience of the past few years has increased our faith in our people, made us more self-reliant and emboldened us to think in much bigger terms than in the past.

Much has happened in these few years which has led to this result. But I think that the most significant development of these years has been in the domain of Community Projects and the National Extension Service. Apart from the practical results which have been achieved, and these are both visible and considerable, there is something even more important, even though it cannot be measured and weighed. This imponderable factor is the spirit of the people, the removal of inertia in thought and action, the development of a team spirit in national work and the sense of partnership of the people in great undertakings.

This represents the new dynamism which is so essential to all progress. It means a social revolution in our ways of life and work which is creeping gradually but surely over the vast land of India.

It is because of this that the Community Projects and the National Extension Service have become, more than anything else, symbols of the resurgent spirit of India. They have not only moved our own people, more especially in the rural areas, but have attracted the attention of other parts of the world, more especially of countries in Asia and Africa which have to face problems rather similar to ours. These community schemes are not a replica or a copy of something from abroad, although we have learnt much from other countries. They are essentially an Indian growth, suited to Indian conditions and therefore with a solid foundation in the soil and the people of India. That is the reason for their strength and their vitality.

The National Extension Service lays a broad foundation all over the country for this work. The Community Projects

are the bright, vital and dynamic sparks all over India from which radiate rays of energy, hope and enthusiasm. Both are necessary.

The country is committed to a socialist pattern of society. To bring about this change, we have to do many things in many spheres of activity. But the essential thing is to make freedom secure and broad-based, to bring the people in close association and partnership with the apparatus of administration and, more especially, with the working out of our Five-Year Plans. We talk of the people's plan and we talk of the people's Community Projects. That is the essence of our approach to this question. No great change can be brought merely by governmental functioning, although that is important, and we aim at great changes.

Therefore it is necessary that these community schemes should be based on the intimate co-operation of the people.

I send my good wishes to this conference and wish it success in the great adventure in which it is engaged.

PLACE OF THE BIG MACHINE

YOU HAVE INVITED ME here on an auspicious day* for this auspicious opening ceremony. I have come here gladly for a variety of reasons. Perhaps some people might wonder what is the connection between Gandhiji and this great factory, for he was apparently not enamoured of great factories. He thought much more of the village and the home. And yet, I feel that this idea is due to a basic misapprehension. I am quite sure that if it had been our good fortune to have Gandhiji with us today, he would have been glad at the opening of this factory. This factory, like all factories, does not come in the way of his basic desire to develop the village industries and generally raise the standard of our vast

Speech at the inauguration of production at the Integral Coach Factory, Perambur, Madras, October 2, 1955

*Gandhiji's birthday

rural and urban population. Some people take rather a narrow and lop-sided view of Gandhiji. None of us perhaps is fully capable of understanding all the aspects of his many-sided character. We cling to one or two aspects not realizing that we do not see the whole of that remarkable personality. Many, I suppose, took the letter of what he said and paid little attention to the spirit, to the underlying philosophy for which he stood. You will remember that often he let us have some glimpses into his mind which would show that that mind was deep and wide and looked not only at the millions of our people but at the whole of humanity.

Functioning at a particular moment in India as the leader of a great struggle against a mighty empire, he brought methods and tools into play which were particularly suited for that struggle as well as for the constructive activity of the nation. He laid stress on village industries and, curiously enough, even those who were critical of him, who were sceptical about village industries and the like, today stand for village industries and the development of our rural areas. Others have arrived only gradually and through painful processes of reasoning at the conclusion he arrived at intuitively. And there is no conflict between that conclusion and this factory or other big factories that we might build because we try to co-ordinate the two approaches. There can be no real well-being or advance in material standards in India without the big factory.

I shall venture to say that we cannot even maintain our freedom and independence as a nation without the big factory and all that it represents. Nor in my opinion can there be well-being and large-scale employment in India, at least for a very considerable period to come, without widespread groups of village industries.

We cannot keep pace with the modern world unless we adopt the latest techniques, whether it is for the big factory or the small, or for village industry. We cannot keep pace with the modern world unless we utilize the sources of power that are available to the modern world. Today, we stand on the threshold of the atomic age. Enormous new resources of power have been placed at the disposal of man. Whether he

uses them for good or ill only the future will show. What we do know is that the power is there and we cannot ignore it. We shall have to use this new source of atomic energy when the time comes. At the same time, everything has ultimately to be judged in terms of human welfare, and the only real yardstick we can employ is the happiness of our three hundred and sixty million people. Therefore, I see no incongruity in my coming here on Gandhiji's birthday and performing the opening ceremony of this great factory.

I go about from end to end in India, seeing new factories come up, great schemes take shape and great river valley projects develop, giving power and nourishing water to our fields. I see the Community Projects and National Extension Service spread in our rural areas with a speed which is remarkable and without precedent in history. Remember this, that perhaps the biggest scheme in India is not this big factory or a hundred other factories, but the hundreds and thousands of Community Projects that are changing the face of India. That is the great revolution that is taking place in the village, and in the heart of India. I see all this and as I see it, I feel excitement creeping over me.

I am impressed by this magnificent structure, which has been built with considerable rapidity and, to the layman's eye, built efficiently, attractively and imposingly. I should tell you that my first approach to this factory was not a pleasing one. I saw a huge ten- or twelve-foot wall. I do not like walls and am allergic to them—I have had too much of walls in my life—and this horrid twelve-foot wall mile upon mile, without a break, almost gave me a headache when I was coming here. I am told that a great part of this wall is not part of this factory at all but a relic of the great repair shop that was here once. Evidently the builder of this factory has carried on the tradition because I saw the wall being continued right up to the main gate. I do not know if this was necessary but if something is necessary, it need not be a plain wall which gives a headache to anyone who sees it. Why must not our factories be beautiful to look at? I must say that it was a pleasant change to pass that wall and come inside. The lay-out of this factory, the shape, the trees, created a much

happier sensation. I like the wide open spaces. Old factories are apt to be crowded and grimy but this is not a bit grimy and will not, I hope, be allowed to get grimy. There should be space and air and light, and I see that provision has been made for them.

All the factories that are coming up in India are interesting in themselves, but to me they are rather symbols of something bigger that is taking place. You are making these integral coaches by processes of welding. Some of us in our own way are also engineers, human engineers, trying our utmost to weld and integrate. There are so many odd pieces in this country which require welding together. There are so many odd things within ourselves, each individual or group, which require integration. Often I feel that we, as a nation, suffer from a kind of split personality. We talk in terms of the highest ideals and act in completely the opposite way. No one in the wide world talks of higher ideals than we do, but our practice does not hold at all with our talk.

There are always two forces at work—the powerful forces that make for integration and unity, and the other forces that constantly work for destruction and disintegration. Everywhere there is a conflict between such forces, more especially in India, where we have just got out of a condition of subjection and have to build anew our country, a country with almost every phase and century of civilization.

I am glad to come here because this was a great dream of my dear friend and colleague, Shri Gopalaswamy Iyengar. I am happy to be here to see the fulfilment of a dream of his. I am glad to come here because I knew that this factory is likely to represent a fairly big advance in our march towards industrialization. And yet, when I see the big machines working, and I see also that most of these machines come from foreign countries, then the obvious thought comes to me that there can be no real progress or real industrialization in this country until the machine itself is made in this country.

EMOTIONAL INTEGRATION

ALWAYS WHEN I COME to South India, the question arises in what language I should speak. I am afraid I do not know your language, Kannada. Otherwise I would most certainly speak it here, because my object is to be understood, not to propagate any particular language; and so I will choose a language in which I can make you understand best of all. Unfortunately, I can speak with some fluency only in two languages, Hindi and English. Normally, of course, I speak in Hindi. I have no idea how many of you here understand Hindi and how many of you understand English. So I am in a quandary. Perhaps, it might be best for me to be bilingual on this occasion, and speak a little in English and a little in Hindi. Anyhow, I should like your help in this matter. Will those of you, who understand English, please raise your hands? Friends,

As I have begun and referred to the question of language, I might as well say a few words about it, because it appears that some people in South India are rather anxious over this question and even somewhat excited.

Now obviously, any decision that we might make about language is likely to cause inconvenience to some, situated as we are in India. Some things are quite clear. First of all, India is a multilingual country. It is true that all our languages are in one way or another associated with Sanskrit. Some, like the northern languages, are descended from Sanskrit; others, though they have independent histories, have nevertheless many Sanskrit words. Indeed, as you perhaps know well, in later years South India became, if I may say so, a greater home of Sanskrit learning than North India. Anyhow, our languages are fairly intimately connected with one another. Nevertheless, they are separate languages, great languages, and they are all languages of India. Therefore in our Constitution we have enumerated these great languages of India as the national languages of India, but Hindi was mentioned as the official, all-India language of India. Why was that so?

The idea is that English should be gradually replaced by an Indian language for those purposes for which it has been used for these many years. I need not go into the reasons. The language for this purpose has to be Hindi. That does not mean the slightest conflict between Hindi and other Indian languages like Kannada, Tamil, Telugu as well as the northern languages. In fact, as you know, all the Indian languages are developing fast, as they should. They are becoming the medium of instruction in the various States, as they should. All that is good. There is no question of conflict between Hindi and other languages.

What does an official, all-India language mean? So far English has more or less been our official language. Obviously we cannot continue English as the official language. Mind you, I do not mean that you should give up learning English. I am anxious that you should continue to learn English and learn it well, as a foreign language. I should like you to learn the other principal foreign languages like French, German, Russian, Chinese, Arabic, Persian and Spanish. As a great, independent country we have naturally to play a part in the world—in international affairs, in politics, in economics, in trade, in commerce, in science, in technology and in many other matters. For this purpose, it is necessary for a sufficient number of us to learn foreign languages. Since we are acquainted mostly with English, it would be foolish for us not to take advantage of our acquaintance with the language and not to continue learning it. And if we learn it, we should learn it well, and not be satisfied with a mere smattering of it. I am not at all opposed to English. I think English is obviously one of the great world languages today, used and spoken more than any other world language, perhaps. Nevertheless, I think it would be totally unbecoming for us in India to adopt as an official language a foreign language. I can tell you that many times it has been rather embarrassing for me as for others who go to foreign countries to have to talk in English to our own countrymen there. People are surprised and ask whether we have no language of our own that we have to talk in a foreign language. To take a very small instance, until now, the words of command in our defence forces were in

English although the average soldier obviously does not know English. This is absurd, unbecoming and embarrassing. Obviously we cannot have our words of command in a dozen languages in India. We cannot have an army spread out and separated in this way.

Then comes the question of communication between two States or between a State and the Central Government. Naturally we would like to use an Indian language instead of English when we are ready. Not that we rule out English which may be used when necessary for scientific and other purposes. I am merely saying that from any national point of view or point of view of self-respect, we cannot carry on official work continuously in a foreign language.

The difficulty arises because there is an apprehension in the minds of many people of the South, that the constitutional provision about Hindi may lead to a disadvantage to them in regard to many matters, more particularly in regard to the all-India services. Now obviously people in the all-India services are recruited from all over the country as they should be. Anything else would be improper. It would also be improper and unfair for examinations or tests that are held for the all-India services to be such that those who do not know Hindi suffer a disadvantage. Many of you must have been in Delhi and seen that the Central Secretariat is full of people from South India. Why are they there? Well, simply because they are found competent and capable. There is no question of partiality. Since we are anxious that the people from the non-Hindi knowing parts of India should suffer no disability on that account we have laid down that the tests or examinations for the all-India services, which are now in English, should later on be such as not to cause this disability. Further, we have said that these tests or examinations should, when the time comes, be conducted in three languages, in Hindi or in English or in the regional language of the candidate. After he has taken the examination and passed, then he will have to take up Hindi as a new language and learn it in order to do his work. Similarly at that stage we shall try to make the Hindi-knowing people take up a South Indian language and pass a test in it.

I know that in every State efforts are being made, quite rightly, to encourage the language of that State in every way. Even in the Central Government, we have a Sahitya Akademi, of which I have the honour to be Chairman, which deals with all the languages of India which have been enumerated in the Constitution. We help all these languages to develop, without any partiality. I know that there are enthusiasts for Hindi and for other languages who get so excited and place their claims so high that they naturally irritate others. We are thinking now of establishing a central publishing house, the purpose of which will be to publish books in all the languages of India and make them available at very moderate prices. These will include translations from foreign languages as well as new books written by competent persons.

At the present moment there is another very important question, the question of the report of the Commission on the redistribution of our States. I hope that it will soon be available to the public so that everybody can read it fully, consider it, digest it and be in a position to form an opinion or express an opinion. There is no desire to hustle this report through and we want to give the fullest opportunity to the public to consider it. That is why we are publishing it before the Government have formally considered it or made up their mind about it. Of course, it will be considered by the different State Governments and the State Legislatures. No change in the Constitution can be made without this complicated process. The point is that the question of the reorganization of States should be considered by all of us as calmly and dispassionately as possible. It does not help us to get excited and it helps still less for people to hold out threats. There is a modern form of threat which is peculiarly unfortunate: the threat of hunger-strike.

When there are conflicting interests, how is one to decide? Surely, there are only two ways of deciding. One is by compulsion, force, armed might—what you might call the power of the stick. The other way is the democratic way, the way of consideration and discussion, and finally of deciding and everybody accepting that decision. Obviously we are not

going to decide this or any other question by armed force. That would be perfectly ridiculous. Therefore, the only other course left is to decide by the fullest discussion amongst ourselves, by the democratic method. The democratic method inevitably implies trying to understand the other party's opinion, a certain give-and-take, and a certain adjustment to whatever the final decision might be. If this does not happen, we simply go to pieces. In a great country like India, there is a variety of opinion over almost every subject. We are not all regimented into thinking one way. Nor should we be. I object to regimentation and to authoritarianism. I want people to develop their own minds and thoughts and to give free expression to them.

But democracy, while it ensures free expression, and freedom of thinking, also demands something else. It demands unified action afterwards. It demands acceptance of decisions taken. Otherwise, there is a break-up. You are acquainted somewhat with the history of India. It has been our misfortune through long periods of history to be very factious, to be liable to separatism, with the result that the great strength of India has been wasted in inner conflict, in inner argument and in fissiparous and separatist tendencies. Surely, we should learn something from the history of India. We have produced great men in every field of human endeavour, in thought, in action, in art, in literature, in music. Yet we have failed to take advantage of this greatness because of the tendency amongst us to disrupt, to go our individual ways. Hence we have been weak, and often subjugated and dominated by foreigners who have come here. I think it is correct to say that foreigners who came here hardly ever really conquered India. Certainly the British did not, in spite of their superior arms. They simply took advantage of the divisions in India. Others who came did the same thing. That is the big lesson of Indian history. And therefore we must learn to hold together. Let us have all kinds of arguments and disputes amongst us. But once we decide, and decide democratically and peacefully, let us act accordingly.

It was in the measure that we acted up to this principle during the great movement led by Gandhiji that the strength

of the Indian nation was built up. I have these last 30 to 40 years in mind : they have been a great period in India's history and much will be written about them by future historians. Those of us who were privileged to live through them and to be minor actors in that great drama of Indian history can never forget them. Others will read about them in history books later; but they will never have that vivid impression which those who participated in them had. And during these forty years or so, Gandhiji trained us repeatedly, repeatedly pulled us up when we went wrong, and taught us about the unity of India amid her great diversity, diversity of States, of provinces, of climate, of language, of religion and so many other things. If you travelled with me to the far corners of India, you would see that diversity even more than you do now. If you came with me to Ladakh, which is across the Himalayas, almost the continuation of the Tibetan Plateau, you would see a different picture of India. The north-east frontier, the North-East Frontier Agency as it is called, or the other hill areas of the north-east, present an entirely different picture of India. If you go to the Himalayas you will see a Himalayan India which is very different from the great central plains or the plateau of the South. Despite this great diversity and variety we have come together. We came together long ago really, and the first coming together was between two mighty civilizations as we call them, between what might broadly be called the Dravidian civilization of India—a very fine civilization, very highly developed, which perhaps was connected with the old Indus Valley Civilization, Mohenjodaro and the rest, going back 5,000 years from now—and the civilization of the Aryan hordes that came across the north-west frontier of India. It was the impact of the two that produced the basic civilization of India which has lasted throughout these ages. Of course, it has been influenced repeatedly because it was a dynamic civilization. If it had been static, it would have been dead long ago. But because there was dynamism in it, it changed itself from time to time, although basically it clung to its roots. All kinds of people came, especially to North India. The Scythians came, the Huns came, the Greeks came and Turks came, even

before the so-called Muslim invasions. Then came the Afghans and the Moghuls. They all affected us, of course, but so great was our capacity to absorb, that we absorbed them all. The newcomers became Indian. They functioned as Indians, from the Indian soil. There was no foreign authority in the sense of an authority situated in a foreign country.

It was only when the British came that the authority that ruled India came to be situated outside India, five thousand miles away. A new element came into the picture. British and European civilization, or more correctly, the industrial civilization of the West, crept in and influenced us. The language of the British also influenced us. It is their language that I now speak to you. So India is a strange land whose peculiar quality is absorption, synthesis. When this capacity for synthesis became less, then India became weak. India was weak for several hundred years because it had become a closed country which did not look outside. In the old days when India was dynamic, Indian expeditions went out far, carrying India's religion, language, culture, habits, art, and archaeology all over the south-east portion of Asia, Western Asia and Central Asia. If you go to the Gobi desert today you will find in the city of Turhan the veins of Indian culture, of Indian art and Indian archaeology. In fact, some of the oldest books in Sanskrit drama have been found in the Gobi desert, not in India. This Indian culture which had been derived from the fusion of Dravidian and Aryan elements, with the vitality of both, was a dynamic thing and it spread out. Asoka, the great emperor, sent his missions bearing the message of the Buddha all over the then known world.

Then came a static period in India's culture. We became closed in in our own country, and forgot the world outside. We were afraid of going out. We developed all kinds of religious taboos and customs, that we must not go out, that we would lose our religion, caste, if we went out, and so on. We developed an exceedingly narrow idea of caste and we split up into innumerable divisions. That was a period of political, cultural and social degeneration for India. It is because of this that we became weak. When foreign conquerors came, we were too weak to absorb them.

Now that we are again free, we have got the opportunity to shed these shackles. We have shed the political shackles. But we have to shed many other shackles. And we have to develop a dynamic mentality again. We have to develop daring and the spirit of adventure and cast aside every custom that binds us down. Our great ancestors had enough daring. In the realm of thought they dared to pierce the heavens; they were not afraid of any idea. They were not bound down to any dogma; they developed a magnificent language, the Sanskrit language, for the whole of India. The Sanskrit language was the classical language. History has taken a turn and we are again free politically. We did not become free politically through political manoeuvres. We are free because we developed certain qualities of freedom. We developed discipline, we developed a new dynamism, we developed a capacity for sacrifice. And above all we developed the habit of working unitedly under Gandhiji. Having developed all these qualities we became free. Now we have not only to keep these qualities, but to develop them still further.

All over India, whether it is our Five-Year Plans or our Community Schemes or our dancing and music or our literature, there is a certain vitality. A powerful life force is acting not on a new or inexperienced people, but a race with thousands of years of experience. All that had happened was that we had forgotten much of that experience. We have to renew our acquaintance with it, and also to gain acquaintance with the new experience of the Western world which has helped to build a magnificent civilization out of science. Western civilization today has many faults which have led it into conflict and war, but it has, nonetheless, been a magnificent civilization. It has brought higher standards to the people of the West through science and technology. It has produced magnificent literature, great music, great art. It is a great civilization and we have to learn much from it. But we cannot learn anything from it if we forget what we are, and uproot ourselves. Therefore, while we must maintain our roots in our soil and our country, we have also to learn much. The problem today for you and me and all of us is how to keep this great experience, this great culture of India, this

great thought of India, how to maintain it, preserve it, nourish it, and how to plant on to it the dynamism and science and technology and thought of the West.

We can see disruptive forces at work in India. Some people are deliberately disruptive. Others are unconsciously disruptive and they become parochial or provincial or communal. They forget the large purposes that we have in view, forget the great destiny before India, forget that India aims high, that India never aimed low.

We should not become parochial, narrow-minded, provincial, communal and caste-minded, because we have a great mission to perform. Let us, the citizens of the Republic of India, stand up straight, with straight backs, and look up at the skies, keeping our feet firmly planted on the ground and bring about this synthesis, this integration of the Indian people. Political integration has already taken place to some extent, but what I am after is something much deeper than that—an emotional integration of the Indian people so that we might be welded into one, and made into one strong national unit, maintaining at the same time all our wonderful diversity. I do not want this diversity to be regimented and taken away, but we must be wary of losing ourselves in petty quarrels. We may often have to accept somebody else's opinion even though we do not like it; that is the way of democracy. That is how we functioned in the Congress movement for forty years. Gandhiji was no autocrat. He could have imposed his will on anybody, but when he did impose it, it was only through his love and affection and through the regard we had for him and for his wisdom. Often we argued with him, fought him, and sometimes even convinced him of our point of view.

The main thing we have to keep in mind is the emotional integration of India. We must guard against being swept away by momentary passion, whether it is religion misapplied to politics or communalism or provincialism or casteism. We have to build up this great country into a mighty nation, mighty not in the ordinary sense of the word, that is, having great armies and all that, but mighty in thought, mighty in action, mighty in culture and mighty in its peaceful service of humanity.

OUR COMMON HERITAGE

AS YOU HAVE just heard from the Chairman of the Municipality, I have visited Trichur many times earlier. The first time that I came here, I think, was twenty-five years ago, and now that I have come again, this past quarter of a century passes before my eyes. I see how after a long struggle we achieved freedom and independence and how since then we have engaged ourselves in an even more difficult struggle, the struggle to achieve economic well-being and higher standards for all our people. Everyone will agree with that objective of economic well-being. Why then do we differ in many ways? Why are there various parties? It is good to have various parties because when there are different approaches to a problem, more light is thrown upon it. I do not believe in all people being regimented to think in one way. I want free flow and free exchange of thought and out of that we sometimes find a bit of the truth.

Nevertheless, why do we differ often and quarrel with one another about the way and the path to be pursued? I want to say a few words about that to you. Wherever I go I lay stress on something that is obvious, with which everyone should agree. I lay stress on the unity of India, not merely the political unity which we have achieved, but something far deeper, the emotional unity, the integration of our minds and hearts, the suppression of feelings of separatism. While all people agree about the unity of India, there are many people and even some parties that act in a way which can only result in breaking the unity of India. Why they do so I do not know. While, on the one hand, we, the people of India, are bound together by strong bonds of culture, common objectives, friendship, affection, on the other, unfortunately, there are inherent in India separatist and disruptive tendencies which raise their head whenever some new question arises. We talk about the reorganization of States. By all means let us discuss it. But why this passion and fury? What does this separatism ultimately mean? Not your affection for your fellow-man,

From a speech at Trichur, December 26, 1955

but your dislike of others. I have no objection to people coming together because they like one another, or to nations coming together because they like one another. But I have the strongest objection to people coming together because they dislike and hate somebody else. The coming together to hurt somebody else is bad. That is why in the international field we are against these military alliances which are not the coming together of people who like one another, but are meant to be aimed against another country or group of countries. Anything is bad the basis of which is hatred and dislike and enmity, international or national.

We must be on our guard against the disruptive tendencies in the country which raise their head whenever an occasion offers itself. Among these disruptive tendencies are some which come under the name of communalism—politics under some religious garb, one religious group being incited to hate another religious group. Then there is provincialism or 'stateism'. There is casteism, perhaps the most insidious and dangerous of all in our country. When the caste system came into being it may have been very good, but for the last few hundred years it has weakened us nationally and socially. It has divided us up into small groups. It has separated us into hierarchies of people, some calling themselves high caste and some middle caste and some low caste and some no caste at all. And so we have this inequality perpetuated, one group being exploited by another. I think that was the main reason for India's weakness and India's downfall.

We have before us all these lessons of history. We have seen how, repeatedly, in spite of our many virtues and our great abilities, we have fallen in the race of the nations, and because of this lack of unity amongst us the entire community of India has been separated into castes and creeds which do not pull together. Therefore, I lay stress everywhere on the unity of India, and on our need to fight communalism, provincialism, separatism, stateism and casteism.

So far as I am concerned, and I hope, so far as you are concerned, there is no division between North and South and East and West of India. There is only one India of which all of us, you and I, are inheritors. It belongs to all of us. This

southern part of India or this State of Travancore-Cochin is not your private preserve. I have as much right to it as you. Likewise, the northern States of the Himalayas are not our private preserve. They are your inheritance also. They belong to you as much as to anybody else in India. So the whole of India from the North to the South is the common heritage of every Indian, and all India's history, from thousands and thousands of years till today, is our common heritage. All the culture of India, whether it comes from the North or the South or anywhere else, is our common heritage, and what is more, the great future that spreads out before us is going to be our common heritage.

THE PLAN IS THE COUNTRY'S DEFENCE

MY COLLEAGUE, the hon. Minister of Defence, will no doubt deal with the broad issues raised in this debate and with the criticisms and suggestions made. I have intervened to draw the attention of the House to certain broad and basic principles of the lines of defence and more especially, the problems that we have to face.

I have noticed in the course of the debate today a certain concern and anxiety about recent events, amounting almost to an apprehension, lest India might be attacked by our neighbouring country and we might not be ready for it. The number of recent border incidents, and more especially the fact that a great foreign country is giving military aid, has led, no doubt, to this apprehension. It is perfectly true that the situation today in regard to the defence of India has been very much affected by this factor of military aid coming in from a great country and we have to view this situation, therefore, in this new light.

The hon. Member who spoke just before me asked us to have the latest equipment and the best training. What

Speech during debate on Demands of the Ministry of Defence, Lok Sabha, March 21, 1956

exactly does that mean? In nothing, I think, has there been such a great technological improvement as in war equipment. Of course, the latest example of that, the final example, is the nuclear weapon, atomic bomb or hydrogen bomb. That is the culmination of this process. It means that no country in the world, excepting the two great Powers, is adequately defended, because only they have enough of these nuclear weapons. How, then, does one judge the adequacy of a country's defence?

Obviously, if some Power which has nuclear weapons at its disposal choose to attack India, from the purely military point of view we have little defence. It may be that from other points of view we may yet be able to meet this menace of the atomic bomb, because a people that have vitality, strength and unity, and a people that will not surrender whatever happens, can never be defeated. I have often said, therefore, that the real answer to the atomic bomb lies in other spheres. I mention this because in the final analysis what counts is not your soldier or your military weapon, but the spirit of unity of the people, the will of the people to survive in spite of every difficulty and every menace.

If I am confident about India, that confidence depends more on the spirit and unity of our people than on other factors. If that is weak, for me it just does not matter how many tanks or how many aircraft we may put in.

Technology has developed so rapidly that if, unfortunately, there is a great war in the future, probably every book that has been written in the past about warfare and every weapon that was used during the last war and previously, would be out of date. Judged from that point of view, we in India and nearly all the countries of the world, excepting a very few, are completely out of date and there is no help for us at present.

What is the equation of defence? In what lies the strength of a people for defence? Well, one thinks immediately about defence forces—army, navy, air force. Perfectly right. They are the spear points of defence. They have to bear the brunt of any attack. How do they exist? What are they based on? The more technical armies and navies and air forces get, the

more important becomes the industrial and technological base of the country. You may import a machine or an aircraft or some other highly technical weapon and you may even teach somebody to use it, but that is a very superficial type of defence because you have not got the technological background for it. If spare parts go wrong, your whole machine is useless. If somebody from whom you bought it refuses to supply a part of it, it becomes useless, so that in spite of your independence you become dependent on others, and very greatly so.

From that point of view probably there are very few countries in the world that are really independent, able to stand on their own feet against the military strength of others. Therefore, apart from the army, navy and so on, you have to have an industrial and technological background in the country.

Supporting all this is the economy of the country. If the country's economy is not sound, it is a weak country. I can give many examples to this House of countries which for the moment may have a good army, but whose strength is really superficial, because the army depends on outside factors, foreign machines, foreign economy, foreign help. Such a country is essentially a dependent country, though called independent.

The equation of defence is your defence forces plus your industrial and technological background, plus, thirdly, the economy of the country, and fourthly, the spirit of the people.

Looking at the countries of the world, there are only two at the present moment which may be termed, from the military point of view, absolutely in the front rank. There are many other countries in between. Where do we come in the picture? Here we are, backward technologically and industrially, and yet, except for Japan, probably more industrialized at the present moment than any other country in Asia. I am leaving out the Soviet territories, and even in regard to China, which is making great progress, I think it may well be said that at the present moment we are somewhat in advance in some ways, industrially considered; certainly not in a military way. They have a huge army. We

have a relatively small army. But I am talking about industrial development and not of other matters.

We belong, therefore, to the so-called under-developed countries, though more advanced in some matters. Take atomic energy. Probably we are in the first half a dozen countries of the world or somewhere near that. I do not exactly know; it is difficult to say. We are certainly not among the first three or four. We are in the next rank.

An hon. Member, I am told, said here : "What is the good of your Five-Year Plans? You must concentrate on defence." That is a grave statement to make. But the Five-Year Plan is the defence plan of the country. What else is it? Because, defence does not consist in people going about marching up and down the road with guns and other weapons. Defence consists today in a country being industrially prepared for producing the goods and equipment of defence.

The right approach to defence is to avoid having unfriendly relations with other countries. Some hon. Members in this House who talk in rather aggressive terms of neighbouring countries, and want to take brave action sword in hand, serve no cause, certainly not the cause of this country. It is one thing for us to be perfectly prepared, because, however peaceful our policy may be, no responsible Government can take the risk of an emergency arising which it cannot face. But any kind of blustering attitude neither is becoming a dignified nation, nor is it safe. It is a sign of weakness, not strength. Therefore, we must cultivate friendly relations, and we must spread the feeling that no quarrel is big enough for war to be required to settle it. To put it differently, war today is, and ought to be, out of the question.

Then we come to the second aspect. The real strength of a country develops by industrial growth, which implies the capacity to make weapons of war for the army, the navy or the air force. You cannot develop an isolated industry without a general background of industrial development. You cannot have a factory producing tanks in the absence of other industrial development in the country. A factory producing aircraft can be erected only if there is a large supply of technically trained people. Therefore our immediate object

should be, both from the point of view of economic development and that of defence, to build up industry, heavy industry in particular.

The criticism may be justified that we ought to have started thinking in these terms even earlier. But the point is that we are at least today thinking in terms of building up heavy industry, iron and steel, machine-making plants, and production of oil.

Take this business of oil. Most of your machines will become completely useless without oil to run them. If we do not produce enough oil in this country, well, the big machines get tied up. There will be nothing to run them with.

Now, we come up against a grave difficulty. Let us admit for the moment that we are proceeding along right lines—those right lines being the industrialization of the country, which is good from the economic point of view as well as for defence. But industrialization takes time.

What will happen before you are strong enough? You may get knocked down in the course of the next ten years. And all your saying 'we are not ready for an attack' will not prevent the enemy from attacking you. This is a difficult problem that every country has to face, to balance immediate danger with considerations of better security later on.

If you think too much in terms of immediate danger and concentrate on it, the result will be that you never get strong enough tomorrow and the day after. Your resources are being spent not in productive ways, not in the growth of real strength, but in temporary strength which you buy or borrow from others. You get a machine from outside. You use it and it does give you some temporary assurance, although it is not very great. But, as I told you, if some part goes wrong, and somebody fails to replace it, you are helpless.

And this difficulty has become even more real for us because of recent developments, more especially the military aid that has come in fairly considerable quantity to our neighbour country. I do not think that there is any marked likelihood of war. In fact, I would very much doubt if any such war is at all likely to take place. And I am trying to think objectively, not merely because I wish it so.

Nevertheless, one cannot ignore the possibility of an emergency arising.

I want to take the House into confidence. The difficulty is this: if we lay too much stress on present-day safety, which ultimately means the purchase of big machines of various types from abroad in adequate quantity, we undermine the economic progress that we envisage. It is a difficult problem for this House to face.

It is quite easy for some hon. Member to say: "Push away your Five-Year Plan and do this." But that is almost a counsel of despair. We cannot sell tomorrow and the day after, because of our fears of today. At the same time, we have to provide for today. That is the problem. I do not pretend to give an answer to the problem here in this House, because it is not a problem which arises at this minute; the problem is there in its broad context, and we shall have to face it from day to day, month to month. To a slight extent, the problem is always there with every country. But the problem has been thrust upon us rather forcibly and rather urgently by these pacts and military aid.

I do not wish the House to think that we are unduly anxious, but we certainly are not complacent about it. I think we would be anxious undoubtedly if we did not feel confident of the spirit of the country, the unity of the country, or lacked the assurance that whatever our views might be in many petty fields, over these large questions there can be no difference.

This, in the final analysis, is the major problem: how far, to ensure safety today, we are to sacrifice and delay tomorrow's development. Some time later in this session this House will be considering the Second Five-Year Plan. In considering that, it will have to bear in mind this particular problem, because if the advice of some hon. Members is adopted in regard to our defence, we shall have to throw overboard the Second Five-Year Plan, if not completely, at least a good bit of it.

It is largely for these reasons that we have deprecated this business of military pacts and alliances and military aid being given. We would welcome civil aid for development of the

country, which really strengthens the country much more than the other type of aid and which has no other implications for neighbouring countries. But the way things have developed in Asia and elsewhere has been rather unfortunate and it has brought this atmosphere of tension and fear in its train.

I have endeavoured to be perfectly frank with the House because this problem is troubling us. It is not a problem to be dealt with in a small way here and there; it is a problem which extends itself not to a few days and months but goes on. We hope that whatever decisions we arrive at from time to time we shall naturally communicate to this House, because other matters will be affected by those decisions, whether it is the Five-Year Plan or some other scheme of development. We cannot proceed in this without the fullest understanding, sympathy and support of the House.

NOT 'HOLIER THAN THOU'

SOMETIMES PEOPLE accuse us and say, "Oh, you are trying to be very superior, or trying to be, as the phrase goes, 'holier than thou'." We know very well our imperfections and the imperfections are greater than those of other countries. If we do not realize this fact, we shall never grow. There are other countries spiritually greater than ours in many ways, and we may be so in some ways too. But I do not like this idea, if I may say so with all respect, of sitting complacently and thinking that we are spiritually greater, even though materially we are not. If we really grow spiritually, material things do not matter. It is because we are not spiritually great, in the real sense of the word, that we look in others for something which we condemn or criticize.

We sometimes venture to express our opinion. Why? For two reasons : first, we think that it is the right of every country,

From reply to debate on International Affairs, Lok Sabha, November 20, 1956

as of every individual, to express its opinion, and out of the welter of ideas truth sometimes emerges. Secondly, we are so placed—and that is a virtue which we possess—that we are not consumed with hatred of this country or that. If a country is consumed with hatred and fear, then its mind is clogged. It cannot think straight. I say with all respect that in the United States there is no clear thinking about Russia just as there is no clear thinking in Russia about the United States, because the minds of both are clogged with indignation, with fear and hatred of each other. I have not the shadow of a doubt that if they come to know each other more—it does not matter whether they agree or not and they probably will not agree about many things—hatred and misconceptions will go and they will realize one thing more than anything else, namely, that the other country, whatever it is, however wrong it may be in its opinion, is a living entity, a growing entity, has something new and worthwhile that has to be studied. That is the important thing. That is why we have always sought to encourage contacts and mutual understanding.

So far as we are concerned in India, we have had this advantage that we can approach other countries in a friendly way. Whether we agree with them or not is a matter which is secondary. Because we can approach them in a friendly and receptive way, we can profit by that contact and approach. At any rate, we remove the barriers of prejudice.

The greatest danger which the world is facing is the cold war. The cold war creates a bigger mental barrier than brick walls or iron curtains do. It creates barriers of the mind which prevent the understanding of the other person's position, which divide the world into devils and angels. We can take it that all of us have something angelic in us, something divine in us, but also that we have a good deal of the Satan in us. Whether we are a country or an individual, we should try out the good in ourselves and take the good from others and thereby suppress the evil aspects.

Now, I claim this as a virtue for us, for our country, for this Parliament and for our people. We are not obsessed by fear. We are not obsessed by hatred of any country. We are not obsessed even by the dislike of any other country. Our

minds are a little more receptive than those of others—communists, anti-communists or socialists. I do think that is a virtue in us and it is in the good democratic tradition. When that goes, it is bad for the world.

THE INDIAN WAY OF LIFE

FRIENDS,

I am emboldened to address you in this intimate fashion because of the friendship and hospitality which you, the citizens of the United States, have showered upon me. I have come to your great country on a brief visit, at the gracious invitation of your President, whose humanity and whose distinguished and devoted services to the cause of peace have won for him a unique place among the statesmen of the world. I am happy to be here, and my only regret is that I can only stay a few days and have no opportunity of meeting many of you personally.

Five years ago, a professor of an American university visited me in Delhi, and gave me a gift which I have treasured greatly. That was a mould in brass of Abraham Lincoln's right hand. It is a beautiful hand, strong and firm, and yet gentle. It has been kept ever since on my study table, and I look at it every day and it gives me strength. This may perhaps give you some idea of our thinking and our urges in India. For, above all, we believe in liberty, equality, the dignity of the individual and the freedom of the human spirit. Because of this, we are firmly wedded to the democratic way of life, and in our loyalty to this cause we will not falter.

Nearly seven years ago, we constituted our country into a Republic, and gave to ourselves a Constitution based on these principles, and guaranteeing the fundamental human rights of freedom of the individual, equality of man and the rule of law. Five years ago we had general elections in our

Television and radio address, Washington, U.S.A., December 18, 1956

country for our Central Parliament as well as for our State Assemblies. These elections were organized on a vast scale by an authority free of government control so as to ensure that they were free and impartial. Early next year we are again going to have general elections in which two hundred million voters are entitled to participate. You will realize the vastness of these elections when I tell you that there will be one million two hundred thousand polling booths, so that no voter will need to go far to cast his vote. As you know, India is a big country with a population of 370 million, one-seventh of the total population of the world. It is a country steeped in history and tradition, with a civilization nearly as old as recorded time and a culture nourished on its own soil and blended happily with those of other peoples and of other lands.

This year we celebrated in India and in many other countries the 2,500th anniversary of a very great son of India, the Buddha, who gave us the message of peace and compassion. Through the centuries India has preached and practised toleration and understanding, and has enriched human thought, art and literature, philosophy and religion. Her sons journeyed far and wide braving the perils of land and sea, not with thoughts of conquest or domination, but as messengers of peace or engaged in the commerce of ideas as well as of her beautiful products. During these millennia of history India has experienced both good and ill. But throughout her chequered history she has remembered the message of peace and tolerance. In our own time, this message was proclaimed by our great leader and master, Mahatma Gandhi, who led us to freedom by peaceful and yet effective action on a mass scale. Nine years ago, we won our independence through a bloodless revolution in conditions of honour and dignity both to ourselves and to the erstwhile rulers of our country. We in India today are children of this revolution and have been conditioned by it. Although your revolution in America took place long ago, and the conditions were different here, you will appreciate the revolutionary spirit which we have inherited and which still governs our activities. Having attained political freedom, we are earnestly desirous of

removing the many ills that our country suffers from, of eliminating poverty and raising the standards of our people and giving them full and equal opportunities of growth and advancement.

India is supposed to be given to contemplation, and the American people have shown by their history that they possess great energy, dynamism and the passion to march ahead. Something of that contemplative spirit still remains in India. At the same time the new India of today has also developed a certain dynamism and a passionate desire to raise the standards of her people. But with that desire is blended the wish to adhere to the moral and spiritual aspects of life. We are now engaged in a gigantic and exciting task of achieving rapid and large-scale economic development of our country. Such development in an ancient and under-developed country, such as India, is only possible with purposive planning. True to our democratic principles and traditions we seek in free discussion and consultation as well as in implementation the enthusiasm and the willing and active co-operation of our people. We completed our First Five-Year Plan eight months ago, and now we have begun on a more ambitious scale our Second Five-Year Plan, which seeks a balanced development in agriculture and industry, town and country, and between factory and small-scale and cottage production.

I speak of India, because it is my country and I have some right to speak for her. But many other countries in Asia tell the same story, for Asia today is resurgent and these countries which long lay under foreign yoke have won back their independence and are fired by a new spirit and strive towards new ideals. To them as to us independence is as vital as the breath they take to sustain life, and colonialism in any form or anywhere is abhorrent.

The vast strides that technology has made have brought a new age of which the United States of America is the leader. Today the whole world is our neighbour and the old divisions of continents and countries matter less and less. Peace and freedom have become indivisible and the world cannot continue for long partly free and partly subject. In this

Atomic Age, peace has also become a test of human survival. Recently, we have witnessed two tragedies which have powerfully affected men and women all over the world. These are the tragedies in Egypt and Hungary. Our deeply felt sympathies must go out to those who have suffered or are suffering, and all of us must do our utmost to help them and to assist in solving these problems in a peaceful and constructive way. But even these tragedies have one hopeful aspect, for they have demonstrated that the most powerful countries cannot revert to old colonial methods or impose their domination over weak countries. World opinion has shown that it can organize itself to resist such outrages. Perhaps, as an outcome of these tragedies, freedom will be enlarged and we will have a more assured basis for it.

The preservation of peace forms the central aim of India's policy. It is in the pursuit of this policy that we have chosen the path of non-alignment in any military or like pact or alliance. Non-alignment does not mean passivity of mind or action, lack of faith or conviction. It does not mean submission to what we consider evil. It is a positive and dynamic approach to such problems as confront us. We believe that each country has the right not only to freedom but also to decide its own policy and way of life. Only thus can true freedom flourish and a people grow according to their own genius. We believe therefore in non-aggression and non-interference by one country in the affairs of another and the growth of tolerance between them and the capacity for peaceful coexistence. We think that by the free exchange of ideas and trade and other contacts between nations, each will learn from the other and trust will prevail. We, therefore, endeavour to maintain friendly relations with all countries even though we may disagree with them in their policies or structure of government. We think that by this approach we can serve not only our country but also the larger cause of peace and good fellowship in the world. Between the United States and India there had existed friendly and cordial relations even before India gained her independence. No Indian can forget that in the days of our struggle for freedom, we received from your country a full measure of sympathy and

support. Our two Republics share a common faith in democratic institutions and the democratic way of life, and are dedicated to the cause of peace and freedom. We admire the many qualities that have made this country great and more especially the humanity and dynamism of its people and the great principles to which the fathers of the American Revolution gave utterance. We wish to learn from you and we plead for your friendship and your co-operation and sympathy in the great task that we have undertaken in our own country. I have had the great privilege of having long talks with the President and we have discussed many problems which confront the world. I can tell you that I have greatly profited by these talks. I shall treasure their memory and they will help me in many ways in my thinking. I sincerely hope that an opportunity may be given to us before long to welcome the President in our own country and to demonstrate to him the high respect and esteem in which we hold him.

We have recently witnessed grievous transgressions of the moral standards freely accepted by the nations of the world. During this period of anxiety and distress the United States has added greatly to its prestige by upholding the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The danger of war is not past, and the future may hold fresh trials and tribulations for humanity. Yet the forces of peace are strong and the mind of humanity is awake. I believe that peace will triumph. We are celebrating in this season the festival of peace and goodwill, and soon the New Year will come to us. May I wish you all a happy New Year and express the hope that this year will see the triumph for peace and freedom all over the world?

AWAY FROM ACQUISITIVE SOCIETY

PLANNING essentially consists in balancing : the balancing between industry and agriculture, the balancing between heavy industry and light industry, the balancing between cottage industry and other industry. If one of them goes wrong then the whole economy is upset. If you concentrate too much on industry, leaving agriculture to look after itself, the country gets into difficulties. In some of the East European countries there have been some inner conflicts and trouble, and probably the real basis of these conflicts was economic. The economy of these countries was not a balanced one. Too much stress was laid on a very rapid development of industry, specially heavy industry, with the result that agriculture suffered, and with it the whole economy. A very eminent economist of one of these Eastern European countries delivered a speech about two or three months ago, in which, criticizing their own plan, he recommended to the people in those countries that they should look at India's Second Five-Year Plan, which was a much more balanced effort. And curiously enough, he recommended much greater stress on village industry and handicrafts to those people.

It is extraordinary how the wheel has come full circle in the case of the Eastern European countries. They started with great emphasis on heavy industry, but suddenly found that, while heavy industry was necessary and important, they must have other bases for their economy, that is, the development of village industry and handicrafts. That is a lesson for us. We believe generally that the industrial progress of India will depend and must depend on the growth of heavy industry. There will be no industrial progress unless machines are made here, unless iron and steel are manufactured here. At the same time we have always to remember that unless we balance heavy industry with the growth of village industry, we shall produce an unbalanced structure which may crack up and fall to pieces. Therefore, the importance of village industry, household industry, cottage industry and small

industry is very great. It is great from the employment point of view, of course; but it is also great from the point of view of balanced production. It is great from the point of view of producing consumer goods. In a static economy, some kind of balance can be achieved at the cost of poverty and the starvation of the people. But in the economy of a developing country, one has to take care at every step lest one step should unbalance some other, and create difficulties. We in this country have tried to lay stress on food production, on heavy industry and on cottage and village industry in a balanced way.

Many of our friends and colleagues, including those who belong to other parties, talk about socialism in what I would call, with all respect, a very rigid way. I do not criticize them, and I do not wish to claim that what we say about socialism is the final word on it. I look upon it as a growing, dynamic conception, as something which is not rigid, as something which must fit in with the changing conditions of human life and activity in every country. I believe that socialism can be of many varieties. Socialism in a highly developed industrial community may be of one type, while in an agricultural country it may be of a somewhat different type. I do not see why we should try to imitate another country, although we should take advantage of the experience gained elsewhere. If I wish to industrialize my country, I have to learn not only higher techniques of industrialization from the countries where such techniques have been adopted and are flourishing, but many other things, such as the way they industrialized. It would sometimes be useful to copy what other countries have done; sometimes it would be useful to avoid it. I do not see why I should be asked to define socialism in precise, rigid terms. What I want is that all individuals in India should have equal opportunities of growth, from birth upwards, and equal opportunities for work according to their capacity.

Much can be said about socialism, but I should like to stress one thing. The whole of the capitalist structure is based on some kind of an acquisitive society. It may be that, to some extent, the tendency to acquisitiveness is inherent in us. A socialist society must try to get rid of this tendency to

acquisitiveness and replace it by co-operation. You cannot bring about this change by a sudden law. There have to be long processes of training the people; without this you cannot wholly succeed. Even from the very limited point of view of changing your economic structure, apart from your minds and hearts, it takes time to build up a socialist society. The countries that have gone fastest have also taken time. I would like you to consider that the Soviet Union, which has gone fast in industrialization, has taken thirty-five years or more over it. Chairman Mao of the People's Republic of China—which is more or less a Communist State—said, about three or four years ago, that it would take China twenty years to achieve some kind of socialism. Mind you, this in spite of the fact that theirs is an authoritarian State, and the people are exceedingly disciplined and industrious. Chairman Mao was speaking as a practical idealist. We must realize that the process of bringing socialism to India, especially in the way we are doing it, that is, the democratic way, will inevitably take time.

We have definitely accepted the democratic process. Why have we accepted it? Well, for a variety of reasons. Because we think that in the final analysis it promotes the growth of human beings and of society; because, as we have said in our Constitution, we attach great value to individual freedom; because we want the creative and the adventurous spirit of man to grow. It is not enough for us merely to produce the material goods of the world. We do want high standards of living, but not at the cost of man's creative spirit, his creative energy, his spirit of adventure; not at the cost of all those fine things of life which have ennobled man throughout the ages. Democracy is not merely a question of elections.

The question before us is how to combine democracy with socialism, through peaceful and legitimate methods. That is the problem India has set before itself. It is a difficult problem, and yet I think we can face it with a measure of confidence. We have achieved many things in the past which were difficult, and there is absolutely no reason why we should not achieve this also. We cannot achieve it by any compulsion or coercion. We have to win the goodwill and

co-operation of the people. Even authoritarian governments cannot function without a large measure of goodwill and co-operation, let alone democratic governments. It is important that we take our people into our confidence, be frank with them about our failings, our difficulties, our hopes and aspirations, so that they may understand. I want you to go to them, to make this election campaign a great campaign of comradeship with our people, of friendship with them, of talking, and discussing these problems with them—not merely a campaign of delivering speeches and reciting slogans.

OUR MAIN FAILING

I DO NOT want any of us in India to hide our failings. We do not get over them by hiding them. One of our principal failings has been, and is, a great tendency to disrupt, a great tendency to forget the basic unity of India, and to get excited about secondary matters. Now, secondary matters are secondary matters, and the moment you make them primary matters, you lose your sense of perspective and proportion and you are lost. That is what we have seen in the recent elections. They have been very good elections, and I think we can be proud of the elections in spite of some odd happenings here and there. But what I am trying to put before you is that the elections have brought up not only this business of caste again, but provincialism and linguism. Kept in their proper place, these may be all right, but if they get out of their proper sphere, they are dangerous to India as a whole. I am not entering into the merits of the arguments that have been raised in regard to States redistribution. The thing has been finalized by Acts of Parliament and it seems to me very foolish, without adequate thought and adequate time having been given and experience gathered, to upset things which

From inaugural address at the 30th annual session of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry, New Delhi, March 23, 1957

have been decided. I want you to think of this and I want others to think of this. Here we are struggling against grave political and economic problems; but some of our friends and colleagues have their minds completely occupied with the question of the boundary of a State being changed or not. It passes my comprehension that people do not see how this concentration on matters of secondary value injures our work in the primary fields of activity, national or international.

It may be that many people are annoyed or angry with something which our Government did. In certain circumstances firing took place. Some people were shot down and killed; others were wounded. I do not think anyone in India can dislike this firing business as I do. I have a horror of it; I think it is a bad thing and I hope that it will be possible to put an end to it. My heart goes out in sympathy for those who may have suffered from it, specially if they are young people who are the hope of our nation. But having noted that, let us not mix up sentiment, however justified it may be, with higher political considerations of the nation's welfare. After all a nation and a people are judged in terms of their maturity. How mature are they? Do they get swept away by tides of sentiment or do they balance things and then act? These are what will be taken into consideration. I hope we are a mature nation and I hope therefore that we shall consider questions that come up before us in a mature way and not merely in an emotional, sentimental way.

THE PLAN AND ITS PROBLEMS

BULLOCK CART, MOTOR LORRY, JET PLANE

IT MUST BE five or six years ago that I last came here to this annual function, and I am grateful to you for inviting me again and giving me this opportunity of meeting you and finding out from you what you have in your minds. Not only I, but my colleagues in the Central Government as well as the West Bengal Government, are always eager to meet and discuss such matters as affect you and affect us in the Government. My colleagues, the Finance Minister and the Minister for Commerce and Industry, who perhaps have more to deal with you than some other ministers in the Government of India, I am sure, will always welcome these opportunities. I say this because in the course of your address, Sir, you somehow appeared to feel that you were not given as many opportunities for consultation as perhaps you wished to have. It may be, occasionally, that this has not been possible or easy, but we accept entirely the principle of consultation in as large a measure as possible.

But you must remember that there is an essential difference in the working of the present Government and the Governments preceding Independence. The earlier Governments could come to decisions more or less as they felt necessary. But we now have independence for the country. Further, we have always to keep in view the fact that the parliamentary structure of Government requires constant reference to Parliament, parties and other organizations. Therefore, it is not a simple question of give-and-take between the Government and the particular interests involved, industry or the like. There are other interests as well, and finally the interest of the people of India, who are no longer prepared

Address to the Associated Chambers of Commerce, Calcutta,
December 14, 1953

just to accept what they are told. They have to be convinced, their viewpoint has to be heard, because ultimately it is their voice that must prevail. Subject to that, in any democratic set-up, there should be as great mutual consultation as possible in regard to matters of industry with those who are chiefly concerned with industry, namely, the employers as well as labour. As you know, when discussions are not just between two parties but are triangular or even quadrangular, it is not very easy to come to agreements or decisions. We, as the Government, have to try and balance all the conflicting views.

First of all, we have to be clear what exactly we are aiming at. The tasks before us are the uplift of the villages, the securing of higher standards of living in the country, greater production, industrialization, use of better techniques and so on. But the country must today have a more solid aim than merely higher standards. It must have a social outlook. I hope it will not be a dogmatic social outlook. We have far too many dogmas. The world has suffered for a long time from religious dogmas. It now suffers from economic dogmas.

And a social approach immediately brings in the people. Our people are awake and conscious and they demand all kinds of things. These cannot be given suddenly; they take time.

You referred, Sir, to our Five-Year Plan. I was glad to see that it was in the context of that Plan that you wanted your various problems to be considered. The Plan is by no means a perfect Plan, but I think what matters is not the Plan so much as the approach. This approach is an attempt to look at our great country, with its manifold activities, as a whole, and to find out what our resources are, what our abilities are and how best to use them without waste. In the first attempt of this kind, it was inevitable that there should be many loopholes. I have no doubt that in the Second Five-Year Plan many of these loopholes will be filled.

There will always be many uncertain factors about such a vast undertaking. Even now, as you know, the Plan is undergoing a certain amount of revision. We are trying to learn gradually. In particular, the question of unemploy-

ment weighs down upon us because a Government—and a democratic Government at that—cannot ignore it. It has social and political consequences which may not have been so evident in the earlier period but which become more and more evident in a democratic society. Because of that and because of other factors, as you may know, we have decided to revise this Plan and to set aside an additional 175 crores of rupees for this period. We learn by trial and error. And if we have the capacity to learn by trial and error, then on the whole it is well with us. It is only those who refuse to learn that get into greater difficulties.

You have referred to what you have called the contrast between the bullock cart economy and the motor lorry economy. May I point out that even the motor lorry, however useful, is rather out of date? You do not refer to modern economy as the motor lorry economy. Modern economy is symbolized by the jet plane and atomic energy. The world moves very rapidly today, and even the techniques you consider advanced are out of date before you catch up with them. I am all for the latest techniques; let there be no mistake about it. But it must be the latest technique applicable to the conditions of India. I cannot superimpose a fifth storey on a house without laying the foundation, and building the first, second, third and fourth floors. In building India, what is the good of my getting from outside some very fine machines which employ the latest techniques if there is no background to fit them in or work them here? The problem is not what you call a bullock cart economy versus later techniques. The problem is how to have the latest techniques so that they fit in with the structure of India. Let us improve our structure, industrial and technical, as rapidly as we can. Let us not superimpose something which may be beautiful to look at, but which we just cannot carry because we have not the ability.

Again, when we consider what might be called the bullock cart economy versus the motor lorry or jet engine economy, sometimes I wonder whether our industrial and economic thinking does not require a great change. We talk about techniques. What do techniques come out of? Maybe

out of some inventor's head. But the odd thing is that in our economic thinking we adhere to some past age forgetting that we have to deal with the modern world with its jet engines and atomic energy. Perhaps in ten years' or fifteen years' time, atomic energy will be used for power purposes. There is a great revolution coming about like the Industrial Revolution of about 200 years ago. We live in an age of rapid changes, but oddly enough, the human mind which brings about these changes lags behind. I do not know what your individual thinking may be, but there are still people in certain parts of the world who talk about *laissez-faire* economy. For me, that is a bullock-cart variety of economic talk, which has no relation with the present. If one wants to live in this modern age of technology, one must also think in terms of modern thought and not fall back from the middle of the twentieth century to the middle of the nineteenth century.

We have to carry hundreds of millions of people with us. It is not an individual's journey or a journey of a few persons, but the march of a great population. In considering economics let us take into consideration the powerful urges that shape the human mind today in every country. Let us consider modern developments and economic thought which have outrun even the great economists of the last generation. But we still function in the old way. You talk about a buyer's market and seller's market. You talk about cycles of economic progress and depression as if it were preordained by Providence that there should be a cycle of ups and downs. You take it for granted. Now I call that a bullock-cart way of economic thinking to talk about preordained, predestined, petrifying economic phenomena. Surely, economic science and industrial science have advanced since those ideas filled the minds of people.

We all know about the great Industrial Revolution that began in England nearly 200 years ago and the vast changes it brought about in human living conditions. Nothing in the world's history in the previous 2,000 years was so powerful in changing human life as the Industrial Revolution and what followed in its wake. Let us take one example out of a hundred: communications. Communications in the world had

been static for thousands of years. Then suddenly something comes in with the Industrial Revolution, and life changes. First it is the steam engine and the railway train; and then the telegraph, the telephone, the automobile, the aeroplane, radio and radar. Thus communications have changed the whole face of the earth. We take all this for granted, and yet we resist the other changes that are coming about, not only in the technical and economic spheres, but in the social sphere as well. We must realize that this is an age of dynamic change, and we have passed the stage when a few persons, whether they called themselves government or captains of industry, could control the many-faceted life of a country and lay down the decree. One has to find an equilibrium among the various forces at work. In finding this equilibrium in a democratic country, one has to take the vast masses of the people into confidence. One has to produce a sensation in them that they are partners in the vast undertaking of running a nation, partners in government, partners in industry. That is the essence of democracy. People used to think that democracy was a matter of giving the vote to everyone. That was no doubt a very important development. But the right to vote spread very slowly. Even in an advanced country like England, I imagine it is less than thirty years ago that every man and woman got full franchise. Previously, political democracy was limited even in England. And yet, England was considered perhaps the most advanced country democratically. There are even now many countries on the Continent of Europe which do not have adult franchise. Under adult franchise you give the people the right not only to elect governments but to control them. The alternative, you know, is an authoritarian structure of government, which you do not approve of, which you do not want.

Therefore we have to accept democracy with all the consequences that democracy implies. It must be a full-fledged, full-blooded democracy, with adult suffrage. When you have political democracy of that type, you are inevitably pushed to what might be called economic democracy. There is no escape from it. Full-fledged political democracy means, progressively, what might broadly be called economic democracy.

I need not advance any argument about the necessity of planning. I believe it is generally accepted, and one good thing that our Planning Commission has done is to make the people of India by and large planning-conscious. In your industries you have to plan; obviously you do not proceed with your industry without planning. It surprises me that people who accept planning in the limited sector of one industry or two, object to the idea of national planning. Whatever it may be in other countries, in under-developed countries like ours, which have to develop fairly rapidly, the time element is important and the question is how to use our resources to the best advantage. If our resources are abundant, it will not matter how they are used. They will go into a common pool of development. But where one's resources are limited, one has to see that they are directed to the right purpose so as to help to build up whatever one is aiming at.

For instance, if we wish to industrialize this country we are not going to industrialize it by having a multitude of industries supplying consumer goods. They are useful, no doubt, but if we industrialize we have to have certain basic, key, mother industries in the country, the machine-making industry, the steel industry and so on, out of which other industries grow. If we do not do that we shall remain dependent on others.

You referred to the very rapid advance of Japan. An even more instructive example is the rapid advance of Manchuria under Japanese control. It was amazing. Conditions now are no doubt different from what they were in Japan. While paying full credit to the Japanese people, and not in any sense criticizing them, I must mention the fact that conditions at that time were peculiar. The Government then was not a democratic apparatus functioning under all the pressures that democracy means. But apart from that, in Japan, as in other countries which have developed rapidly, like Russia, they laid stress on capital goods and the development of the key industries. The other industries came subsequently. That is a hard way, because in developing that way you deny relief to the people for some time. It takes years before you see the results, but when the results come, they are

fast, they are solid, they are lasting. It is always a difficult matter to balance the needs of today and the needs of tomorrow or the day after. But Government has to do it, and industry also ought to do it. They have to think ahead. Essentially, we should like to lay stress on this solid foundation upon which industrialization can be built. The work of laying this solid foundation does not generally attract private industry because it does not pay for years to come. I am not talking about individuals. I am talking about the private industrialist in general. He would like a return on his capital within a year or two. In a country like India, the burden of development therefore falls on the Government. Of course, we welcome private capital and private enterprise, but, the responsibility for development, as I said, falls on Government. In a highly developed country like America, conditions are different. But in India it has become inevitable that if we have to build on solid foundations and go up, Government must be a party to it. The public sector thus becomes very important.

But however important it may be, the private sector not only remains but has an important role to fulfil. I have no doubt about it. I do not see any conflict between the two, just as I do not see any essential conflict in what might be called the big-machine economy and the cottage-industry economy, which you might call the bullock cart economy. Looked at from the point of view of nineteenth century economics, we could well go ahead paying no attention at all to what happens to the workers and the masses of people. We could go on developing industrially, accumulating reserves for investment and the like, but at a cost in human terms which no government can possibly face today. Take a simple fact. I speak subject to correction as to figures, but I believe that even now there are far more people employed in the handloom and hand-weaving industry in India than in all the organized industries. Are we to ignore these millions simply because of some economic theory? An autocratic or authoritarian government might do it; it might enforce its will at a terrific cost. But no democratic government will do it. Why do we, after all, want industrialization, and the adoption

of the latest techniques? Not for the sake of merely having a big factory or a big machine, but for human betterment, for the betterment of the people of India. Are we going to have human betterment at some later stage by sacrificing human betterment today? These questions cannot be dealt with by some kind of abstract economic theory. The happiness and wishes of millions of people are involved.

That is how the question of employment comes into the picture. Every modern economic theory today bases itself, unlike the previous ones, on full employment in the country. We cannot produce employment by legislation. Our economic approach must be such that we can reach the stage of full employment within a measurable period of time. Every one of our steps must be aimed at that. I do not mean that industry should not retrench people where retrenchment is necessary or that they should carry on with useless people. I think that for the Government of India in New Delhi, it would be conducive to far greater efficiency if the staff were reduced, not at the top so much, but at the lower level. I cannot do it easily, because, for social reasons, I just cannot push them out into the streets.

You will forgive me if I do not deal with some of the things you have referred to—the taxation structure, the super-tax, the income-tax and various other types of legislation. I am speaking perhaps in a heterogeneous way in some fear of the Finance Minister to my left. I am not committing my Government in any way. What is taxation meant for? Well, to carry on the business of government. Can we also say it is meant for the progress, the advancement and the development of the country? Yes and no, both, I would say. Because, in effect, taxation can never be enough for the larger purpose. You cannot, for example, industrialize the country by the process of taxation. One of the principal objects of taxation, apart from that of running the government machine, is to equalize incomes. To prevent disparity is to equalize incomes. To prevent disparity is the social object of taxation. The whole object of a graded income-tax and super-tax is to lessen the big differences that exist. The difference between the very rich and the very poor is perhaps

more in India than in most countries. You talk of labour troubles and many other problems of yours. I think you are justified in complaining against them, more especially against the resort to violence. But how do you deal with it, apart from the governmental or the law-and-order point of view? You cannot deal with masses of people merely that way. You can only deal with them by the human approach, making them realize that they are not outside the pale, that they are not mere hewers of wood and drawers of water, but that they perform an essential function in this business, that in fact they are partners in a great undertaking.

I should like you to think for yourselves how far you have deliberately tried that humaneness of touch with the people you deal with in your offices and factories, and how far you have made them feel that they are partners in a great undertaking. I recently went once again to the Damodar Valley. I saw hundreds and thousands of workers doing odd jobs, carrying earth and so on. Meanwhile, the engineers, full of enthusiasm for the job they were doing, were explaining to me maps and charts. When I asked them, "Have you ever tried to explain some of it in simple language to these workers who are carrying and shovelling earth from one place to another?", they said, "No." I called a few hundred workers there and sat by them. I asked them: "What are you doing?" They said, "We are carrying earth from here to there." I said, "Why?" They said, "We don't know." And then very briefly I tried to tell them of this magnificent undertaking, the Damodar Valley, which they were building. I told them that great canals, great power-works and factories would arise, that work opportunities for them would grow, that irrigation would prosper, and that there would be more food. I explained all this to them in very simple language. They felt it had something to do with them, that they would profit by it, and I hope that they took a little more interest in their work afterwards. Suppose all our engineers there explained things to them from time to time and took them into their confidence; I am quite sure that they would have more willing and more intelligent workers, because they would be producing in them a sense of partnership in a great adventure.

Have you ever tried to do that with your office and factory hands? Do not think that these people are too dull or too unintelligent to understand it. Perhaps more than any other person in India at present, I have come in contact with vast masses of human beings. If any of you were present at yesterday's meeting at the Maidan, you would have seen half a million people or more. I come in contact with them and I am receptive to their feelings. And because I am receptive to them I can make them somewhat receptive to what I say. It has to be mutual. If I went about like a schoolmaster or a boss ordering them about, their receptiveness would close up. I go as a colleague and a comrade and I credit them with intelligence to understand the most intricate problems. I talk to them about international affairs. I doubt whether many of our educated people know much about international affairs or their intricacies. Yet, I take the liberty and have the temerity to talk to the peasant in his field about international affairs, about our Five-Year Plan, about the great things we are doing and I put it to him in simple language that he is a partner in all this progress. He grows interested when I tell him of this great land of India from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin, and of all of us working together for the great common good. This human approach was always necessary, but today, with our democratic set-up, it is doubly essential because it is really the people who finally decide.

As you have said much about labour relations, I would put before you our basic approach to that problem. You object, I understand, to tribunals and their functions. Then what are we to have? Are we to leave matters to the internal conflict between labour and capital, to what you call strikes, lock-outs, and the rest? Long ago, about twenty-five years ago, I was President of the Trade Union Congress. Not merely because of that but otherwise too, I have been in touch with workers and understand their psychology somewhat. I do not approve of bogus trade unions being set up, or of attempts to split up the trade union movement by employers or others. It is far better for industry to deal with well-organized, disciplined trade unions than to have conflict within the trade union world. It is true that trade unions

occasionally do not function rightly. Wrong people get into them and incite men to adopt wrong methods. You have to deal with them, no doubt, but you can only deal with them satisfactorily by that human approach which I mentioned. I have no doubt that in the future the participation of labour in industry will grow and should grow.

I am all in favour of trade unions. I have been in favour, in theory, of labour's right to strike because I have read the history of the labour movement in England and Europe for the last 150 years. And I think every employer should realize the terrible time labour has had for generations, how they were crushed, how they were sent to Australia for the pettiest offence, as life-term convicts, and how, slowly, by means of co-operative efforts, the trade unions gradually gained some—I cannot call them privileges—normal human rights. That is why labour prizes the right to strike jealously. That has been its only sanction. And yet this business of strikes and lock-outs should be faced. Apart from the wastage involved, this conflict is illogical and wrong. The only other way is to find mutual agreement, or if there is no mutual agreement, to bring in some third party in the shape of conciliator, arbitrator or tribunal. A tribunal may not always decide rightly, from the point of the employer or of the workers. That argument could be advanced in the case of our normal judiciary, because one party or the other is bound to be dissatisfied. Are we then going to abolish the judiciary? If tribunals and conciliatory processes do not function rightly, let us improve them. But it has to be recognized that the alternative is conflict, which is bad and which will ultimately result in upheavals and the cracking up of the whole economic structure.

As I said in the beginning, we are facing entirely new problems in a new age which itself is rapidly changing. We have to face them with not only not the bullock-cart habit of mind, but not even the nineteenth century or the early twentieth century habit of mind. I am not prepared to accept that the only way for industry to flourish is to encourage acquisitiveness. You may call it by the name of the incentive of profit. I want you to have the incentive of profit, undoubtedly,

but within limitations. But to believe that human beings are such that without this acquisitive instinct they cannot function properly is to do mankind a great injustice. All the great things in the world have been done not through acquisitiveness but the reverse of it. All the great inventors, the great scientists, the great writers, the great musicians, even our great engineers, have prospered and made the world advance because of other urges.

SIGN OF MATURITY

THE THINKING of India has gradually shifted from the political plane to the economic plane. It is a sign of far greater maturity in a nation to think of economic issues than of political issues which, however good or bad they may be, are not the real problems. This is happening in our country. To some extent, it is happening in a few other countries of Asia too.

Many things have led to this, one of them being our planning. I remember, when we started this Five-Year Plan, there was not much understanding of planning even amongst some of our senior colleagues. There was much less appreciation of it among the general public. It may be said today that the people are Plan-conscious, though they may not understand its intricacies. Making lists of projects and determining priorities is not the whole of planning; merely the starting of new factories is not planning. Planning involves a host of interrelated economic considerations. It is not enough if more is produced; what is produced has to be consumed; if it has to be consumed, you have to make sure that people will have more purchasing power. Let me give an example of how each decision involves various factors. You all know that there is demand for more and more railway lines. But we can have new lines only where there are goods to carry, as, for example,

where we have a steel plant. Great quantities of raw materials will go to a steel plant, and the steel that is produced will have to be carried to distant parts of the country. So the railway lines in the area will have to be developed. But such development will be limited by our financial and other resources.

Planning requires the collection of a great deal of data. We did not have enough information at our disposal when we drew up the First Five-Year Plan. But we have more data to go upon now. You may have seen some documents and pamphlets that have been issued by the Planning Commission. There is the Plan Frame which bears the name of Professor Mahalanobis, though he is only one among the twenty or thirty who have framed it. His name has been given to it, but numerous people advise him. The Plan Frame is what might be called the draft of a draft. That is, it is the barest skeleton which will enable people to think on certain lines. The figures given in it are not final; they may have to be changed. But the point is that the Plan Frame has given thought to and balanced the various factors that planning involves, such as production, consumption and transport.

The Plan Frame was considered by the Economic Section of our Planning Commission and by the Economic Section of the Finance Ministry. They have produced a pamphlet agreeing, by and large, with the projects and even with the estimates. All these papers were placed before the Panel of Economists selected from all over India, of which the Chairman is Prof. D. R. Gadgil, one of our most eminent economists. They produced a memorandum. Being cautious people, they did not give a final opinion about the figures mentioned. They said the figures might have to be checked, but the general plan was acceptable. They also carefully examined the basic question of what our rate of advance should be. All our planning will depend on the target. Roughly speaking, our rate of advance has been, in the last five years, an addition of 3 per cent per annum to our national income, that is to say, 15 per cent for the five-year period. They came to the conclusion, all of them, that that was not enough. It was barely enough to keep the country going

and not slip back. We could go ahead if we made the rate of advance 4 per cent or 5 per cent or more. What does that mean? Roughly speaking, every one per cent increase involves an investment of Rs. 1,000 crores. If you want to have a rate of advance of 5 per cent, you will have to invest Rs. 5,000 crores, that is, you will have to find Rs. 2,000 crores more than the present investment. Where is the money to come from? Either from taxation or as loan and aid or in the form of services. Because of these considerations, any figure that we choose must be practicable. On the other hand, it is absurd to choose a figure which is so low that it does not even let us advance. Let us remember that our population is increasing all the time, which means that the number of people who come into the labour market and who need employment keeps increasing. I think that the population increase is four and a half million or five million every year. Of this, I believe, 18 lakh people are added every year to the employable number. We must not only absorb all of them but expand the reservoir of jobs. Now, 3 per cent is not enough; 4 per cent is enough and a little more; and 5 per cent makes a fair dent on this problem. Well, the Economists' Panel said, "Let us have 5 per cent. It is within our capacity, provided we work hard." As the Panel has said, it will be a great burden, but we have either to make this 5 per cent or be unable to achieve our objective of reducing unemployment. According to figures, about 12 million persons need employment.

The National Development Council then considered all these questions. The Council, as you know, consists of the Planning Commission, Central Ministers and Chief Ministers of all the States. They could not go into the detailed figures. They accepted broadly the approach contained in the Plan Frame and they agreed that we could not go below 5 per cent annual increase.

I have read some criticism in this connection in newspapers and periodicals. It is hardly any criticism. I might mention that there were 20 or 22 economists on the Economists' Panel. They all agreed with this approach except one who presented a kind of minute of dissent. So far as we

are concerned, we have agreed with the majority of 21 and not with the minority of one. One of the criticisms made is to the effect that this amounts to introduction of authoritarianism or communism. It has been said, for example: "Professor Mahalanobis has five or six Soviet experts in his Institute and puts across communist and authoritarian ideas. Dr. J. C. Ghosh has come into the Planning Commission and he is a communist or has Leftist tendencies." And so far as I am concerned, I am always supposed to be a doubtful quantity! Now, if there is good in anything communistic, I am going to have it. I do not function in a communist or anti-communist way. I take what is good for my country. We have a democratic framework. We value it. We propose to adhere to it and to plan within that democratic structure. If anybody is going to tell me that a democratic structure means no planning, I am not prepared to accept that statement. If a conflict should arise between planning and our constitutional structure, then we shall have to think of what structure to have because we have to make progress. All this confusion comes in because some people imagine that a democratic structure necessarily involves absolute free play to private enterprise without interference from the State. There is absolutely no reason or justification for that assumption. Obviously, in a democratic structure you cannot adopt authoritarian methods and force something down the throat of the people. We won't do it. We can take the people with us to the extent they agree to go. We have to do that within our democratic structure.

It is completely wrong to believe that private enterprise can do without planning. If there is a large plant, its directors have certainly to plan its production. Every big undertaking requires planning. And the running of such a huge undertaking as India, with 360 or 370 million people, cannot be left to chance.

Of course, no plan can be a final plan. It always improves with experience. We want to add to our national wealth. We feel that no great progress can be made unless we develop our heavy industry. In the First Five-Year Plan we did give consideration to the development of heavy industries. But

essentially we paid more attention to agriculture and river valley projects. Now we have to develop heavy industry in a big way. But there is a special difficulty with heavy industry. Whatever money we put into this work, a thousand or two thousand crores of rupees, will be locked up, so to speak. That is, heavy industry does not produce anything for the first four or five years. This means that money goes into circulation, but it is not balanced by extra goods produced, with the result that inflation might occur. We have therefore to balance heavy industry with the production of such other goods as can be consumed, so that the additional money that we pump in, in the form of the people's wages, salaries, and so on, can be utilized in buying goods which are available. In thinking thus of consumer goods, we have also to think of the employment position. Heavy industry will no doubt employ people, but they will be relatively few, maybe a hundred thousand or two hundred thousand or at best a quarter of a million. But in heavy industry, if you consider the relative proportion of capital put in and man-power used, man-power will be low. Heavy industry is capital-intensive, not labour-intensive.

Now we come to the conclusion that to balance this heavy industry, we must have village industries and small industries on a wider scale, producing consumer goods. We are not leaving out or ignoring what might be called the light industry. That grows and that will grow, but so far as the State is concerned, we want to lay stress on heavy industry on the one side and village and small industries on the other. There are two reasons for this preference. First, they give employment to large numbers of people; and secondly, they will produce goods—in large quantities, we hope—of a certain type, chiefly for the rural area and sometimes even for the towns. We want to use, as far as possible, the latest techniques in village industries. We do not believe in old techniques merely for the reason that they are old. We must have the latest methods, provided we can use them in the household, in the cottage, in the village. We certainly want to use electric power, if we can get it. Therefore we are having several institutes which can teach improved techniques and better

methods of production in household industries. This is probably the most difficult thing that we have to tackle. It is not so difficult to put up an iron and steel plant as it is to organize India on the basis of rural production which involves supply of raw materials, employment of higher techniques and the provision of marketing and credit facilities. Finally, we want to do it in a co-operative way, that is, through organized co-operatives. It is a terrific job, bigger than the big plants that we have put up.

Then again, you know that one of the biggest things that we have done, and are doing, is the Community Projects and the National Extension Service blocks. I wonder how many of you have visited them. You write about them, of course; but I wonder how many of you have been there. What is happening over the face of rural India is something really remarkable. Without exaggeration, I say that it is a revolutionary thing that is happening in rural India. People coming from other countries have been astounded at what they have seen, but our own people do not realize it. People from diverse countries, England, the United States of America, Russia, Indonesia, Burma, West Asian countries, carrying with them different viewpoints, have all been surprised at this development, which consists not merely of higher production, but even more so of the development of the human being. I should like you to bring this home to the people through your newspapers, because we want to carry the people with us. We can never succeed in this programme unless we have the wholehearted co-operation of the millions of people in India.

We propose to move fast. Only thus can we mobilize adequate resources and create the proper atmosphere. Even now we can sense the beginnings of a new atmosphere of self-reliance, because of the success of the First Five-Year Plan and the improvement in the food position. The successful Community Projects have produced a new awakening in these areas. The Community Projects and the National Extension Service blocks are functioning today in a hundred thousand villages of India. That is a large number, and by the end of next year it will be 1,50,000 or so. Our main problem is

the training of field personnel for this work—the village level worker, the supervisor, and the like. Having done that, our further problem will be to run these through non-official agencies and with public co-operation.

Q. What is the experience of public co-operation on the Kosi project ?

A. My experience in regard to Kosi has been, broadly speaking, very pleasing. I know of the criticisms that have been made. You can criticize Bhakra-Nangal; but when you say that this or that engineer misbehaved—even if it is true—you should not forget that you have something in Bhakra-Nangal which will stand for generations and centuries. Likewise in Kosi, we have done plenty of work, through *Shramdan* and so on. Thousands of miles of roads have been built. But Kosi was our first experience of public co-operation on a large scale in a major project. Many persons doubted if people would come. Many good people, who were favourably inclined, said: “How can we get twenty or thirty thousand people voluntarily to come and help us in this?” The engineers were doubtful as to how they could deal with these people. They are used to having a set of trained people working under contractors. To adjust to large numbers of villagers who were coming and offering to do work was something new to them.

Far more people came forward than anybody had imagined, twenty to thirty thousand people in fact. We had to stop them from coming. That such large numbers were prepared to come was itself a very encouraging factor, even if nothing else had happened. Of course, they were given wages. They were paid slightly less than the others, I think, but they were all peasants and came not to earn wages, but because they were interested in the Kosi project. The appeal was: “Here is this Kosi river causing disastrous floods every year. Come and help.” So they came to help. I cannot say their work was a hundred per cent up to standard, but that is another matter. In fact, many engineers reported that some of the peasants had done very good work.

On the eastern bank of the river, conditions were difficult. Even supply of drinking water was difficult. So people who

came went away. It is quite easy to point out where we did not quite succeed in reaching our target. But basically the Kosi experiment of public co-operation succeeded. We have learnt from it and we shall do better next time.

Q. Sir, you said that the national income is to be raised by five per cent per year in the Second Plan. You also anticipated that an investment of a thousand crore rupees would be necessary to raise the national income by one per cent. Therefore, we would roughly require 5,000 crores of rupees. Has any of these economists, or Prof. Mahalanobis, calculated with equal precision the resources that would be available for the Second Five-Year Plan?

A. I shall tell you what happened. You see, planning has now become more and more statistical. The calculations are extraordinarily complicated. I have seen some thirty or forty papers on it, and I regret to acknowledge my ignorance of the mathematical formulae used in many of these. I think it was in September last that, in the Planning Commission, we broadly discussed the question of how soon we could put an end to unemployment in India, both existing and future. How much investment would be necessary? How much time? Could we put an end to it in ten years' time or in eleven years? And we put these questions to our statisticians. Would they calculate? They need not give the final figure, but it would help us to understand the problem if they could calculate on a ten-year basis.

The Planning Commission specifically referred this matter to our statistical people headed by Prof. Mahalanobis. Among his colleagues were a number of foreign advisers, professors who came to lecture at the Indian Statistical Institute from a variety of countries, America, England, Belgium, Norway, France, Russia, Poland and Japan—a remarkable variety of them with somewhat different views. But when thinking statistically there was a good deal of common thought among them. Thus Prof. Mahalanobis and his colleagues produced this Plan Frame.

The calculation of resources which they made can be done by you to some extent. You can calculate what the revenue has been in the last four years. You may presume

that you can raise more, say, 20 per cent more, by taxation. Then you can calculate how much of loans you can raise. You could also compute what aid you might get from foreign sources. Then you can calculate how much you can get, apart from money resources, in the shape of labour and so on. The lowest limit is the present. The upper limit is as far as we can go. The statistician can do this job better because he has better knowledge. In fact, the Planning Commission has appointed a special committee of experts to calculate our resources. I have enumerated some factors, but one factor is uncertain. That is : how will the 360 million people of India work? Will they work hard? Are they prepared to undergo some burden, some austerity? And to what extent? I shall give you an instance. In wartime a country works infinitely harder than in peacetime. People put up with dangers, and they produce more, because it is a life-and-death struggle for their country. It is difficult to expect them to do so in peacetime, but they may function somewhere between the normal peacetime level and wartime level if they are conscious that what they are doing will make their resources go up. Take the last National Loan that was issued. It had a fairly good response. If you analyse it, you will find that in some areas where the popular approach was greater than in others, the response was much greater. Where it was a purely governmental approach, the response was smaller. If people realize that when they give money to Government they are giving money which will come back to them in the shape of better facilities and more wealth, then of course they pay more. Thus, much depends on a right approach to the people.

CONCEPT OF LONG-TERM PLANNING

I THINK THE DISCUSSION we have had since yesterday, which was initiated by Prof. Gadgil, has been very helpful in bringing out certain important considerations as also the different approaches. There has been a considerable measure of agreement, even though the emphasis may have varied. It is agreed by all—and that indeed is our firm policy—that we should go towards a socialist structure of society. We want that not because of some emotional feeling but for very practical considerations. We cannot meet the social problems of the day except in that direction. I hope everybody realizes that to achieve socialism or indeed to achieve any kind of a really high standard in this country is a long-term process. It is not good to delude the public that we can achieve it quickly. Even in China Chairman Mao repeatedly talks of achieving socialism in twenty years in spite of all the authoritarian powers that they have and the tremendous capacity of the Chinese people for work.

We talk of Russia, but we forget that it is 38 years since they have been at it, apart from communism and other considerations. I asked the Soviet leaders who were here, when they thought they would achieve their objective of a communist society and they said that it would take fifteen or twenty years more—whatever their idea of a communist society is. Perhaps it means abundance for everybody.

We have to go fast, both because we desire to go fast and because of the compulsion of events. If we do not, undesirable things may happen. But in going fast, we have to be clear about the objective. That objective has been laid down. We have to be clear that everything that we do, apart from being advantageous to us in an economic way, is on right lines.

All this seems to me to indicate the great importance of what I would call long-term planning. We can then see whether what the country does in the next five years, for example, fits in with our objective of ten or fifteen years hence. It is not enough merely to test it by some broad concept of

Speech at a meeting of the Standing Committee of the National Development Council, New Delhi, January 7, 1956

socialism. It is most necessary that we must have a clear idea of what we hope to achieve in fifteen years' time. Then we can come to the shorter plans which must fit in with the broad general scheme; and then to the shortest plan, the One-Year Plan or the Annual Plan, which also must fit in with the larger scheme. The difficulty is our minds are not clear about what we want India to be fifteen or twenty years later, and that is perhaps the reason why we get mixed up even in regard to our shorter plans.

Two things are necessary. The first is long-term planning. The second, concentrated planning for relatively shorter periods, that is, a year at a time. The Five-Year Plan should be a broad framework, subject to suitable changes, not only in keeping with our resources, but also of the ultimate long-range picture that we may develop. It would be easier to adopt the shorter plan when we have the fifteen years' objective before us.

Allied with the scheme of production and the right trend in production is the projection of internal policies on international affairs. I am talking in general terms, not of India primarily. I think the cold war in the world today is not merely a projection of communism and anti-communism, but in a sense the culmination of industrialization and the conflict between the big Power groups. Previously these conflicts took place among the Western Powers, for instance, between Germany and England for colonial territories. But now it has moved on to the world plane. This is the result of the new technology which may be typified by the hydrogen bomb. It has brought us to a certain crisis which requires very deep thinking as to where the world is going. I am not prepared in the least to copy either Russia or America, because both may be, from India's viewpoint, utterly and absolutely wrong. Both may succeed in a narrow plane, and they have succeeded, for example, in reaching a very high standard of material comfort. America has succeeded and Russia, no doubt, will also succeed, provided America and Russia do not collapse before that through war. But we need not regard as inevitable all the other things that happened in these highly industrialized countries when they achieved material

advancement. We have seen that they have led them in a direction which may ultimately bring about ruin, in spite of the high state of civilization that they have produced.

I do not mean to say that India is spiritually developed. Other countries too may have so developed or may not have. Talking of India's spiritualism merely confuses the issue. But I do think that India, situated as she is, has a chance of evolving, on her own lines, a relatively high standard of living without getting into all the difficulties and dangers which this mad race for economic or other power has brought about. I am not anxious that everybody in India should have a motor-car or a washing machine or a refrigerator. But I am very anxious that the right trend should be encouraged.

The problem of modern civilization is the concentration of power to which industrialization leads. Those who have the atomic bomb have got every power; it does not matter what parliaments you have, they have got all the power. And that power means a diminution or restriction, obviously, of national freedom and individual freedom. How to reconcile this inevitable concentration and centralization with individual freedom is the problem of modern civilization. I do not know whether it can be done or not. It involves psychological changes which in turn are determined by the structure of society we live in. Therefore we should develop that structure of society which encourages the right impulses.

I think capitalism has done a great deal of good to the world, even though it involved suffering to many people. It is absurd to be always cursing capitalism. But capitalism and the type of society it brought about have had their day. Indeed, capitalism even in England is different from what it was in the nineteenth century. Should we in India go through the same old process and then reverse it? We have the choice before us and we have the experience of others. Why not take the benefits of the higher technological and industrial experience, without necessarily getting the wrong consequence which will create difficulties and cause internal and external conflicts?

I believe in our capacity, in India, to win over people rather than fight them. Of course, we can do that only when

we have, in addition to the friendly approach, the necessary pressure also. If we settled the Indian States problem, it was not only by goodwill but also by the pressures that were exercised by the new Government of India and the people of the States. Also there was the desire to settle it in a friendly way, not to crush them. Between these forces, we came to conclusions and arrived at settlements. No doubt, we paid heavy sums of money as privy purses to the princes, which might not have been logical but which nevertheless was justified in the circumstances, because we thus brought about a very major political change without conflict and without the expense a conflict involves. I think this approach can be applied to the problem of social change too. We can bring about social changes and developments by the pressure of democracy and also by a friendly, co-operative approach, rather than the approach of struggle and elimination.

I think that even in the industrial sphere, the reaction of Indian industrialists as a whole has been good, and I do not see why we should not utilize that. It creates an atmosphere of co-operation favourable for going ahead.

We talk of the public sector and the private sector. Obviously land and cottage industries are in the private sector, although there too I should like to see the enlargement of the co-operative element. In fact, that is the only way we can succeed. The only way to meet high-level centralization is to have co-operative centralization. The smaller units cannot survive against the big unit, unless they are united in a co-operative system which gives them the same advantage as the big unit with centralized apparatus.

I am not against medium-sized industry or big industry. As I see them, all basic industries should be State-owned completely, while the medium and the small industries should be co-operatively owned.

That can only be a gradual process. Meanwhile private enterprise should have scope. If you allow any enterprise to function, then you should give it adequate scope. But certain industries we want to reserve for the State, because a particular thing may be strategic, i.e., of basic importance, since through its ownership you can control other things.

Private ownership has not helped mineral development. Such things as heavy machine-making plants, minerals, etc., I think, should be owned by the State. There may be an intermediary period. I do not believe in nationalization as such because when you nationalize, you have got to pay compensation. I just do not see why we should waste our resources compensating other people, unless it is a matter of something coming in our way which we have to change. I am not referring to services like banking and insurance because they are basic and you may have to take them over, but as regards factories, I would rather put up a new factory and compete with the private factory. If any private owner comes and tells me that I am invading his realm or that he is suffering from it, I will say : "Well, I am sorry. After all, if the State sets up some plant and if somebody suffers, it is the State's interest which is more important than the private owner's." No field of activity is sacrosanct for the private owner but certain fields of activity should be sacrosanct for the State. The rest is an open field and there we should give every opportunity and freedom for private enterprise to grow. We should encourage every element to produce and to help in nation-building, subject always to the consideration that wrong tendencies are discouraged.

Take our Industrial Policy Resolution of 1948. Prof. Gadgil has said that it does not go far. Possibly it does not, and we can revise it. But I really feel that we have not acted up to it fully. Take, for example, coal. Many State Governments have gone about distributing licences widely to private owners and we find that we are tied up by these licences. Of course, we can acquire them but I am quite sure the State Governments never realized the consequences and went on in the old way. Our coal policy is being affected very much today by the way the State Governments have proceeded. But we do not want to do anything now—even if the 1948 Resolution was not fully acted upon—which will come in the way of production.

Someone suggested that where the Government gives aid or money to the private industries, to that extent Government could assume some kind of a control over them. I do not

personally see why it should not be done. I think the Government should be represented. I am not enough of an expert to express an opinion about this matter but the idea seems to be good. When we give money which really strengthens a business, there is no reason why we should not also profit.

Much has been said about lack of technical personnel. I do not think there is going to be any real difficulty about technical personnel. We have able persons and there is no doubt that we can train up more. There may have been delay but we are starting to train them up. I go a little further and say that scientific and technical personnel should be introduced not only in the technical processes but in administration also. The administrator is an able man and does a good deal but his thinking is on different lines from that of a technical man. I think there should be a greater inclusion of the technical and scientific type of thinking in our administration. It is good to mix the pure administrator with the technical man and the scientific man. After all, all problems today are problems of science and technology. An able administrator or an able politician, just as an able lawyer, can grasp the broad outlines of a problem, but it is another thing to have grown up with all the processes. I think, therefore, the scientists and technicians should be associated more and more with administration and planning.

I am convinced that we should adopt the highest possible techniques. We cannot have outmoded techniques, but the introduction of advanced techniques should not mean throwing people out of employment.

I entirely agree about our giving social amenities. We are constantly being faced with the question of higher salaries, higher wages, etc. I think if we spend half the money that we give by way of higher wages on social amenities it will be much more satisfactory and useful. Obviously, the first things are education and health. There are other amenities, too, which are more expensive, like housing and slum clearance. These too are receiving our attention.

Some people mix up democracy with capitalism. Simply because democracy has grown up in some capitalistic countries, it does not mean that democracy is an essential

part of capitalism. They imagine that any kind of socialism necessarily means authoritarianism. It does not, at least in theory; in practice, I think it depends on how a country will develop. Democracy must mean removal of disparities. That is plain.

Another aspect connected with the private sector is the association of foreign capital with it. I am not against foreign capital coming in. But when foreign capital comes in, it produces a certain effect. When the State borrows on its own terms and gives aid to the private sector we know where we stand. If foreign capital is associated with the private sector through the agency of Indian capital, it may play a greater part. I am not saying that foreign capital should be kept out, but it is right that we should be aware of the complications that arise.

There are one or two more matters that I want to refer to. Two or three weeks ago, a Chinese expert on agrarian co-operation was here and addressed our Planning Commission. The Planning Commission was impressed by what he said and by the way China had developed her agrarian co-operatives with extreme rapidity. It may be, of course, that they can do things more rapidly because they can wield the big club. Even so, I do not think this explains away all other things. I understand the Planning Commission is sending a team to study agrarian co-operatives in China. There is no doubt in my mind that our whole system of co-operatives helps only the bigger people; in fact it discourages the poor people. The co-operative system should be such as to help the poor man and encourage him. I believe that a development of the co-operative system is most important and essential.

Shri V. T. Krishnamachari referred to the Second Five-Year Plan being the basic preparation for the Third Plan. It thus becomes a long-term plan. We have to see that, at any rate, by the time the Third Plan comes in, we are progressively in a position to build our own machines. We may not be able to do it fully, but it is a question of what effort we make. We have been talking of having three more steel plants but nothing was done in the First Five-Year Plan.

Even if we had put up one plant then, what a tremendous difference it would have made and what a saving of foreign exchange ! We are now buying steel all over the world. Is it not better to be prepared? I do not want the same kind of lag to occur in regard to the machine-making industry.

OPEN-MINDED APPROACH

I HAVE COME BACK to this organization after a number of years. So far as I can remember, I was first attracted to it for a variety of reasons, among them being the dominating presence in this organization of Shri Visvesvaraya, and I should like to pay a tribute right at the commencement today to this grand old man of India. I am amazed and inspired by his vitality, by his deep interest, even at his fairly advanced age, in the industrial and economic development of India. He writes to me from time to time and indicates his impatience at the slowness of progress and sometimes thinks that our Planning Commission would do much better if it followed his advice more closely than it has done.

As a matter of fact, our Planning Commission has always paid the greatest attention to whatever Shri Visvesvaraya has written. You referred in your address to a scheme for rural industrialization he started in Mysore which is being continued there and which, indeed, has been partly adopted in parts of Bombay and in other areas. It was not through any lack of appreciation of that scheme that we did not adopt it wholesale elsewhere, but because to do so would have meant an upsetting of many things. In fact, we are going in a parallel direction through our Community Projects, which, I think, are a very notable and, as I have said elsewhere, a revolutionary line of action in this country.

In the course of your address you have said many things with which I agree very largely, and in fact, you have broadly

Address to the Conference of the All-India Manufacturers' Organization, New Delhi, April 14, 1956

associated yourself with many of the objectives and policies of the Planning Commission as stated in the draft outline of the Second Five-Year Plan. I am glad of that, not merely because you have expressed your agreement, but because you are men of experience in your own line, and it is out of that experience that you have said what you have stated in your address and in your resolutions. It is a commonplace now to say that we are, in India and in the world, going through quite an extraordinary period of transition, a revolutionary period in which it might well be said that almost everything that has been previously stated in the domain of policy or programme is out of date. Entirely new considerations have come in which have upset all the theories of all the old pundits in every department of human activity, whether in the science of warfare or in economics. New powers have been let loose, or are going to be let loose. The pace and tempo of industrial development has been so tremendous in the last twenty or thirty years that the whole conception of things has changed.

If our friends, the communists, rely on Marx, who was a very great man and who threw light on the development of various processes in history, they rely on something that is completely out of date. I think Marx was a very great man and all of us can learn from Marx. But the point is that it is grossly unfair to ask Marx, who belonged to the middle of the nineteenth century, to tell you what to do in the middle of the twentieth century. Even as this may be said about Marx, it may be said about other orthodox communists and others who have written books mostly in the nineteenth century—and some in the early twentieth century—under conditions which were entirely different, different even in Europe or elsewhere, and much more so, of course, so far as we are concerned. Those books were written with Europe or America in view, not the conditions in under-developed countries like India.

Personally, having been some kind of a student of history and historic forces, I am fascinated by these technological changes, not merely from the point of view of the manufacturer or the engineer, for whom they are very important,

but from the historical point of view, because they are changing the whole texture of human life and are likely to usher in a world, if not in my lifetime, in the lifetime at least of most people alive today, which will be radically different from the world we know.

Just as the world coming after the Industrial Revolution in Europe was radically different from the world of the pre-industrial age, so, I think, we are likely to emerge into a social structure all over the world radically different from what we know today. We in India, who are, indeed, at the beginning of an Industrial Revolution, have to take a jump over various periods. That is to say, we have to pass through the Industrial Revolution at a time when we have also to pass through what might be called the Atomic Revolution. That is a confusing thing. It may, of course, be helpful, too, if we do not have to go through all the painful processes of the early days of the Industrial Revolution. All this should make us continuously alert mentally, so that we might not get into old grooves.

We say, and I am glad you agree with it, that we want a socialistic pattern of society. That is a phrase which means, in one word, socialism. Do not imagine that it means anything other than socialism. A socialistic pattern is socialism. Some people seem to make fine distinctions among socialistic pattern, socialist pattern and socialism. They are all exactly the same thing without the slightest difference. But what they are is not such a very easy thing for anyone to put down and define, except in the broadest terms. We have not approached this question in any doctrinaire way. And that is good, because doctrinaire thinking leads to rigidity and rigidity of outlook at a moment of great change in the world is bad, because it leaves us high and dry. This should not mean that we think of a socialist pattern of society in some flabby, goody-goody way, though there are many people, perhaps more in India than elsewhere, who indulge in rather sloppy thinking on these subjects, and who think that by an expression of goodwill to all and sundry they have done their duty.

After all, we live in a social set-up which has its good points and which, undoubtedly, has its bad features. It is not

much good our expressing vaguely our disapproval of the bad features or taking them for granted. We have to fight them and remove them just as, let us say, we disapprove of untouchability and of caste. It is no good passively expressing disapproval. We have actively to do something to remove an evil in our social structure which comes in the way of human happiness, human co-operation and human progress.

Therefore, when we say that we are not doctrinaire it does not mean that we should confine ourselves to this kind of vague goodwill and not follow it up with clear thinking. The human approach is essential, and there is a tendency sometimes in the best of us, whether we are economists, or Government officials, to forget that, after all, whatever our job is, we have to deal with humanity, and ours is not some statistical job in an office. Having said that, I say it should be a clearly thought-out approach, always taking into consideration the changing circumstances and taking advantage of the experience of the human race thus far. Conditions in different countries are not the same. Therefore, it is not wise to adopt wholesale some other country's experience for one's own country without thinking how far it is adaptable. One adapts as much as one can, but one maintains one's own foundations because one deals with human beings, and human beings differ from one another. Even their thumb impressions differ; much more their minds. An engineer knows, more or less, the strength of his steel, or the strength of his wood or stone. The person who works with human beings finds it much more difficult to lay down any rule about all of them. Our approach therefore has to be a knowledgeable approach and an open-minded approach and always a human approach. The moment we forget the human approach, somehow the foundation of our thinking is removed.

Now you know that in the draft of our Second Plan which is being finalized and will be placed before Parliament fairly soon, stress has been laid on heavy industry, and, on the other hand, on cottage industry.

In your address, Mr. President, you have gently complained about not enough attention having been paid to what might be called small industries or medium industries. You

are partly right in saying that, but not completely right. That is to say, no one thinks that medium industries are not important. But the point is what the State as a State should encourage. Medium industry may require encouragement by the State. In fact, we do encourage it, but medium industry essentially can hold its own if the State creates a favourable atmosphere for it. Only a day or two ago I was reading a report by one of our senior officers who went to the Punjab specially to see the small and the medium industries, not the cottage industries' type but a little bigger, and he said he was astonished at the great progress made in the Punjab, the exceptional initiative shown by the people there. Many of them were newcomers, displaced persons who had come from Pakistan having lost all their property and with practically next to nothing. It was amazing how they had built up these small industries and shown enormous ability and inventiveness, even to the extent of making their own tools. For instance, a man had some kind of a machine serving his purpose very well. He was asked: "Where did you get this?" He said, "I made it." "How?" He said, "Well, you see, I went to the Industrial Exhibition in Delhi and I saw a machine in the Polish Pavilion, which I rather liked. It was much too expensive for me; so I drew a little chart of it and I have made my own machine and it serves my purpose very well." Now, that is what I call an extremely valuable quality in the human being, this spirit of doing things, of inventiveness, of adapting, not waiting for others to do it, not waiting for machines to come down from the United States or from Russia or Japan, but setting about it himself and getting things done. I do not wish to compare one State with another, but I should like to congratulate the Punjab and the Punjabis on the possession of this quality, because ultimately it is this quality that will tell and nothing else. We talk so much about policies, but they are important only in so far as they help in releasing national energy and opening out opportunities to the people who want to work.

We talk about industrialization. Previously people's idea of industrialization was one of increasing the output of consumer goods, with consequent employment. The idea now is,

and I do not think it can be challenged, that if we really wish to industrialize, we must start from the heavy, basic, mother industries. There is no other way. We must start with the production of iron and steel on a large scale. We must start with the production of the machine which makes the machine. So long as you have not got these basic things, you are dependent on others and you can never really grow rapidly enough. Once you have got these basic things, you grow as rapidly as you like. It depends upon your own energy; you are not bound down by any external factor; you start a process of self-growth.

Now a country gets moving only when it has started this process of self-growth. The difficulty in an undeveloped or under-developed country is that it has not got that process of self-growth; it has to be pushed all the time because its poverty and its under-development are pulling it back. Once you have crossed that barrier and self-growth comes in, then processes are generated which automatically carry it forward.

Therefore, if you think in terms of industrialization you must think of heavy industry. I would say it is essential to have heavy industry even for preserving your freedom and independence. It might be said that no country is thoroughly and fully independent today which has to rely on another country for various essential articles, whether for defence or other matters.

I should imagine that two of the tests of the progress of a nation are : how much iron and steel it is producing and how much power it is producing. I do not want your lists of factories and other things; if you tell me how much power, hydro-electric or thermal, it has been producing, then I can immediately form an idea of its industrial development. So also with iron and steel. Now you know that we are pushing ahead as fast as we can with iron and steel, with three new factories. And our Commerce and Industry Minister indicated the other day in Lok Sabha that after this Five-Year Plan, he wants to double or treble the output of iron and steel in India.

We have struggled, in the last five or six years, through various stages of thinking on planning, gradually getting our

thoughts a little clearer than they were. And we have some more data than we had previously. Our statisticians are very helpful. Although, even now, the material at our disposal is very limited in regard to social and other statistics, still we have a little more than before. And our thinking is getting a little more definite. I think we have made a good deal of progress both as groups and as a nation in regard to planning.

This afternoon I am attending what is called a university forum on planning. Every university is sending, at our invitation, two or three persons, a professor and a senior student, to discuss this matter because this is essentially a matter which people should understand, discuss, and put out ideas about. It does not do for some very wise man at the top to impose his ideas on the country and insist on those being carried out.

Your organization can obviously perform a very important task in this business of thinking, in the business of making suggestions to us and in every other way, because we have to struggle in regard to two or three matters. One is the essential nature of centralization today. If we have an iron and steel works, we cannot have little bits of it here and there; again, if we have a plant for making huge machines, it must be centralized. Centralization has become essential; yet centralization has its dangerous aspects. Therefore we are in favour of decentralization. After allowing for the essential parts of the centralized structure, we want as much decentralization as possible, and we want that decentralized sector to be worked on co-operative lines. Certainly all of the cottage industry sector should be worked, I think, on co-operative lines. The land sector, which is so important, I think, should also be worked on co-operative lines, because, as soon as you think in terms of small patches of land under peasant proprietorship, you have to think of somehow making them co-operate and the only way out appears to be agrarian co-operatives.

The work we are doing in India is extraordinarily exciting and fascinating. It is not repetition of something that has been done elsewhere. It is really the evolution of something new in new circumstances. And therefore, it has an element of creativeness and artistry in it, and I want you to appreciate that.

THE SECOND FIVE-YEAR PLAN

SIR, SOME DAYS ago I had the honour of presenting to the House the report of the Planning Commission on the Second Five-Year Plan. I presume that many Members have read it since then either fully or in parts.

I have now the honour to move the following Resolution :
“This House records its general approval of the principles, objectives and programmes of development contained in the Second Five-Year Plan as prepared by the Planning Commission.”

Those hon. Members who have read this report have probably not found it very light reading. A report of this type can hardly be termed light reading although, I believe, there are many parts of it which are exciting reading. Few of us can say that we agree with every single word in this report, and with every single proposal. A report of this type is the product of the labour of a great many persons, not only Members of the Planning Commission, but a vast number of other people who have been consulted. Among them are experts of our own country and of foreign countries and others representing various interests and professions in the country. As with all joint products, there is an attempt to meet different viewpoints. I hope this House will view the report as a whole, keeping in mind the unity of approach, objectives, methods and principles underlying it and not so much the details. It is open, of course, to any hon. Member to criticize or to make suggestions in regard to any part of the report, whether it be principles or details. But I submit that the important thing is to get hold of the main principles. I propose, therefore, to deal with the broad principles only.

The subject of this report is obviously not only of the highest importance but something that produces in me very great excitement. It is an exciting subject because it deals with the future of 360 millions of people. To some extent that future will affect the future of other countries and even of the rest of the world. It therefore becomes an enthralling and

Speech initiating the debate on the Second Five-Year Plan in Lok Sabha, May 23, 1956

exciting subject. We are engaged in the shaping of the future of India. Surely, there could be few subjects more exciting than this. It is, therefore, with a sense of the burden of history upon me and upon this House, that I face this problem. It is also with a great sense of humility, because, however great and however competent we may consider ourselves, we are small in relation to this mighty theme of building up our country and taking its millions of people forward during the next five years.

These five years are only some kind of a period that we fix for our convenience, because there are no isolated periods in the march of a nation. It is a continuous march. We must really think in terms of even longer periods and in terms of several Five-Year Plans. This is the second. Nobody thinks that at the end of the Second Plan we shall have been at the end of our journey. There is no journey's end when a nation is marching. Leaving out the ultimate ends, even such a goal as we envisage, the objective of a socialist pattern of society, is not going to be achieved at the end of the First Five-Year Plan or the Second. It may require three or four Five-Year Plan periods before we can say with some confidence that we have very largely achieved it. Therefore, we must keep this larger perspective in view. In planning, especially, we are apt to forget the larger perspective and lose ourselves in some particular aspect which is of importance and yet which may very well come in the way of the larger perspective. For example, take the question of regional development. We are all agreed that there should be a uniform development all over India. We are all agreed that disparities, not only as between individuals in regard to income, but as between the various areas in India, should be removed, that there should be equality of growth and opportunity all over India. But, if we start applying that principle regardless of the other objectives and perspectives, we may spoil the whole Plan. We may not have very much to give to any region. Therefore, in looking at the Five-Year Plan, we have to think really of several Five-Year Plans. That is why it is becoming more and more important that we should, in addition to the period we are dealing with, have a longer perspective in view.

The Second Five-Year Plan necessarily deals with what might be called material objectives. They are very important because it is on the basis of certain material achievements that we can build other achievements. The Plan deals to some extent, no doubt, with culture and like matters. Nevertheless, it confines itself chiefly to material advance. That does not mean that we in this House attach no importance to other aspects of human life. Indeed, all the material advance that we may achieve may, perhaps, be worth nothing at all, and may avail us little, if we forget the moral, spiritual and other aspects of human life.

We stand in the middle of the twentieth century, and this period has seen far-reaching changes all over the world. There have been wars and revolutions. The tempo of change is very great. Any plan that we make, like this Five-Year Plan, is subject to the great political, economic and technological changes that we are witnessing.

All of us have some kind of ideology, some kind of philosophy of life. We may not be philosophers, but without some kind of philosophical or ideological approach, we would have no yardstick to measure things by. And yet, our ideologies and philosophies of life somehow do not fit in with this middle of the twentieth century. This may be due to the fact that though facts change and circumstances become different, we still hold on to old lines of thinking. The human mind is singularly conservative, and it does not change easily. We hold on, if I may venture to say so, to some out-of-date philosophical or ideological approaches. Take the question of war. Many people say that because of various developments in the world, war has become, or ought to become, out of the question. War was useful—whether good or bad—if it helped you to realize your objective. When it does not do that, when in fact it does the reverse, then no person should indulge in war.

I should like to extend that parallel a little further. If a war, atomic or other, is now something that can only be considered excessively foolish, cold war becomes more and more absurd. Cold war exists; it goes on, but really, analysed in the circumstances of today, it has little meaning.

Likewise, certain other approaches—some economic approaches, which may have a great deal of truth—just do not fit in with the present circumstances.

The major fact of today is the stupendous growth of technology, the tremendous growth of the productive apparatus of society, the tremendous power that human beings possess and are likely to possess in the form of atomic energy. These things are not quantitative changes, but qualitative changes in society.

Of course, in India we have not been very powerfully affected by the technological process. We have read about it, but we have no real sensation of it. In planning, however, we have to think in technological terms, because it is this growth of science and technology that has enabled man to produce wealth on a scale nobody could even dream of earlier. It is technology which has made other countries wealthy and prosperous, and it is only through the growth of technology that we shall become a wealthy and prosperous nation.

If you looked at the picture of India—and that would apply to many other countries under colonial rule—ten years ago or twelve years ago, you would find a static, even a stagnant society. Either we remained where we were or we even went backwards. I shall mention a few figures. Take, for instance, the post-war period. In 1948-49, the national income was Rs. 8,650 crores, and the *per capita* income Rs. 246.9. In the next year, the national income was Rs. 8,820 crores, and the *per capita* income Rs. 248.6. In 1950, just before the First Five-Year Plan, the national income was Rs. 8,850 crores, and *per capita* income Rs. 246—that is, it had slightly come down even from 248. You see the national income remaining more or less the same, or very slightly creeping up, and the *per capita* income remaining the same or going down. Meanwhile, of course, the population has kept growing.

This was the state of affairs for several decades before the First Five-Year Plan began functioning. At the end of the First Five-Year Plan, we have a national income of Rs. 10,800 crores—nothing very remarkable, but nevertheless significant. The *per capita* income has gone up from Rs. 246 to Rs. 281 at the end of the First Five-Year Plan period.

As I said, there have been far greater increases in other countries where the pace of development has been greater. Nevertheless, the First Five-Year Plan made a significant change in the nature of our static and stagnant economy. It broke that barrier of poverty which is the curse of a poor country and out of which it can hardly grow, because poverty breeds poverty. I do not say that the First Five-Year Plan has broken down the entire barrier, but it has made the first effective breach in that barrier in regard to national income and in regard to *per capita* income. Now, in the Second Plan, we have to make a bigger breach.

In many countries, it so happens, the old rule prevails : unto those that have, more shall be given, and from those that have not, even what they have might be taken away. So the poor countries remain poor and the rich countries become richer and richer, with more surplus, more investment, more production. So it goes on. The rate of progress in some countries, from reports that we see, is 5 per cent per annum, 6 per cent or even 10 per cent or 11 per cent.

We have aimed at 5 per cent in this Plan, and 5 per cent is going to be a hard job. We shall have to work very hard, because we have started at such a low level, with such low surpluses. India is almost at the lowest rung of the income ladder. Even China, I believe, is a little higher. So was Russia at the time of the Revolution.

The First Five-Year Plan has, as I said, made a significant breach in this barrier which prevents a poor country from going ahead. How does the Planning Commission think of the future? Naturally, it is an estimate ; nevertheless, it is not purely guesswork; it is based on such thinking and statistics as we possess. I have just told you that at the end of the First Five-Year Plan period, the national income is Rs. 10,800 crores. At the end of the Second Plan period, we expect it to reach Rs. 13,480 crores and the *per capita* income to go up from Rs. 281 to Rs. 331. For the Third Plan period, we envisage the national income going up to Rs. 17,260 crores and the *per capita* income to Rs. 396. For the Fourth Plan—that will take us to 1971—the national income is expected to go up to Rs. 21,680 crores and *per capita* income to Rs. 546. This is

some kind of a rough estimate of what we think the progress of India might be in the next twenty-year period.

This depends on many factors that are uncertain. The whole idea of the Planning Commission may be upset to our advantage by new developments in science and technology. The Planning Commission cannot tell us what scientific and technological developments will come about. Therefore, we may go ahead faster. On the other hand, if by some misfortune we cannot work as hard as we hope the country will, we may not achieve our target.

We have often repeated that this Plan is a flexible Plan. What does that mean? It does not mean that it is a vague Plan for us to change and throw about, or for us to say, "If we cannot achieve this, we shall fix a lower target or extend the period by another year or two." It does not mean that. Naturally, if by *force majeure* it becomes absolutely impossible for us to do anything, we cannot help it. But by flexible I do not mean that these targets are loose targets. We want to achieve them; we are going to try to achieve them.

I may tell the House that even after the preparation of this report there has been a change. While considering it, just previous to its printing, the National Development Council refused to accept one of the main targets that we had laid down, something of vast importance to us, the target for production of food grains. The National Development Council thought the target was too low. It directed that it must be raised, not raised by a little. The figure that is given in the book, I believe, is 15 per cent additional food production in the next five years. The National Development Council felt that this was totally inadequate and said we must try to achieve 40 per cent or at least 35 to 40 per cent. It is a very great jump from 15 to 40 per cent. Were we just engaging in wishful thinking? No, I think it is possible to achieve nearly 40 per cent increase.

So the House will see that even as the report is prepared, and even as we here in Parliament are considering it, our minds go further. It is in that sense that the Plan is flexible. We shall consider the targets every year, and vary them, if we think it necessary.

We are now going to have annual plans. Every year a report of the Annual Plan will be placed here which will give a more precise indication of the targets for that year. I hope to place a report of the Annual Plan of the first year of the Second Five-Year Plan before this House during the next session.

We have said that our objective is a socialistic pattern of society. I do not propose to define precisely what socialism means in this context because we wish to avoid any rigid or doctrinaire thinking. Even in my life I have seen the world change so much that I do not want to confine my mind to any rigid dogma. But broadly speaking, what do we mean when we say "socialist pattern of life"? We mean a society in which there is equality of opportunity and the possibility for everyone to live a good life. Obviously, this cannot be attained unless we produce the wherewithal to have the standards that a good life implies. We have, therefore, to lay great stress on equality, on the removal of disparities, and it has to be remembered always that socialism is not the spreading out of poverty. The essential thing is that there must be wealth and production.

There is a good deal of talk about ceilings, and one naturally tends to agree with it because one wants to remove disparities. But one has always to remember that the primary function of a growing society is to produce more wealth; otherwise it will *not* grow, and one will have nothing to distribute. If in the process of fixation of ceilings or in any other method of producing some kind of equality, you stop this process of wealth accumulation, then you fail in your objective. Therefore, whether it is in industry or agriculture, the one and the primary test is whether you are adding to the wealth of the country by increasing the production of the country. If not you become stagnant in that field. In order to reach equality, as I hope we shall, sometime or other, we need not follow the road of some artificial fixation of ceilings but a hundred paths which gradually take us there. An artificial attempt may indeed prevent us from reaching it.

Remember this : while we plan, while we work, our population also grows. I gave the House just now the estimated

figure of our national income in the next twenty years. By the end of that period the population of India will be round about five hundred million. This rate of population growth is not very great; it is far lower than that of many countries of Europe and elsewhere. But when a big population grows, the numbers added are also big. There is always the question of population pressure, and all that we produce has to be produced not only for those who live today but for those who are constantly added to our numbers. The rate of our economic development will obviously depend on the growth of the population, the proportion of investment or the proportion of the country's current income devoted to capital formation and the return by way of additional production. The most important factor is the amount that we invest in relation to the national income. That percentage is always a small percentage in under-developed countries. It is a big percentage in a country which is fully industrialized and developed.

It is obvious that one of the major problems we have to face is unemployment. It is a terrific human problem which we cannot ignore. Merely giving some kind of occupation to a large number of persons does not ultimately increase employment or lessen unemployment. We delude ourselves if we think so. An hon. Member of this House remarked—outside the House, I believe—that a good method of giving employment to a large number of people would be by abolishing the railways. In that event there will probably be some kind of hand-carts. If many people will be pushing them, some, no doubt, will be sitting in them. That would be a completely wrong approach to this problem. Employment comes through newer and more effective means of wealth production. The whole experience of the past two hundred years shows that it comes with the growth of technological methods. It is true that technological growth often leads to human misery. But precautions can be taken. Do not imagine that *minus* technological progress we are going to deal with the problem of unemployment. We cannot. Every country which boasts of full employment today is a country which is technologically advanced. Every country which is not

technologically advanced has unemployment or underemployment. Therefore, if India is to advance, India must advance in science and technology, and India must use the latest techniques, always keeping in view, no doubt, that in doing so, the intervening period, which always occurs, must not cause unhappiness or misery. We have to provide for that even at the cost of progress because that is no progress which brings suffering and misery in its train.

Now we have been planning more or less methodically for the last seven years or so. As we have tried to plan, we have, if I may say so with all respect, grown a little more expert in planning. We are getting more educated in this process. We have had the advantage of discussing these matters with many experts in India and elsewhere, realizing that the problems will have to be solved by us, not by the experts. But the experts throw light on different aspects of the problems and make us think, and they point out our mistakes.

So, gradually, through painful processes of thought, we have proceeded along this path of planning. We want to arrive at a stage when we can assess accurately what the next stage is going to be, visualize our problems in advance, and take appropriate action before events force our hands. That is, after all, the object of planning. Even people who do not believe in planning—they are becoming fewer and fewer—people who believe in what is called free enterprise, are gradually realizing the limitations of free enterprise. In a country like India, situated as we are, there can be no free enterprise in the absolute sense. In our circumstances, I am quite certain that with an unplanned “free enterprise” approach, we cannot make any progress at all. If there is any progress, it will be lop-sided. We can put up factories here and there, but it will result only in riches here and greater poverty there. That is not what India aims at. Further, the total wealth production of the country will not be as great as through planned effort. That is a patent fact requiring no proof. The essence of planning is to find the best way to utilize all resources—of man-power, of money and so on—and the essence of free enterprise is to leave these things more or less to chance. Well, if chance is a more satisfactory way

of dealing with the problems of life than carefully-thought-out methods, then, of course, there need be no planning at all. It means trusting to luck. It is the old idea of *kismet* or fate. That is no good.

All over the world the idea of planning is being appreciated more and more. For an under-developed country, particularly, planning is essential. It may not be so necessary in developed countries; they can perhaps do without it. But there is no other way but planning for an under-developed country like ours.

Again, India is part of a region—South Asia or a good part of Asia—which is more or less undeveloped. As a matter of fact, even the progress and development of India necessitates the development of the countries around India. I do not mean to say that we cannot develop unless those countries also develop, or that we should interfere with them. My point is that it is in our interest that other countries also develop. To think that the development of other countries comes in our way is true only in a colonial pattern of society where we want to buy cheap raw materials from a country under our influence and impose our goods in a protected market. That does not apply to free countries. It is in our interest, politically and economically, that other countries in Asia and Africa should also develop. We cannot, unfortunately, help them much, because our resources are limited. But the House knows that even with our limited resources we have done what little we could to help our neighbour countries in Asia and Africa.

I mentioned to the House that we intend raising the target of our agricultural production, not only because we want an adequate supply of food in this country, but because we want more food even for export. Let that be understood. There is a big gap in the Plan. How are we to cover that gap? For the moment there is no obvious way of covering it. One may well criticize us by saying that we have indulged in some pious hopes in leaving the Plan as it is, but there are so many uncertainties about human life and about planning in a great country. For my part I do not think it is beyond our capacity to fill that gap, and more than fill it.

One of the chief problems is foreign exchange. How are we to get foreign exchange? The normal way to get foreign exchange is to export goods. We cannot live in expectation of the bounties of others. If somebody helps us, we welcome it thankfully, but we do not plan merely in the expectation of others being bountiful. Therefore, it becomes essential for us to export, whether it is foodgrains or industrial products or machines or something else that we may have. We have to think more and more in terms of exporting, in order to import what we want. There is no other way out. I believe that if we pay enough attention to export, we can go much further than has thus far been envisaged. We should think in terms of more and more exports and we should build up markets, and build them up in terms of State trading, so that we could profit in a greater degree.

In all this, agricultural production has a very special importance. First of all, there can be no really stable industrial economy in this country without a stable agricultural basis. We paid considerable attention to agricultural production in the First Five-Year Plan, and we made greater progress than we had expected. But we have to do a great deal more. We intend to have another forty per cent increase, and that is a great deal. We can do that, when we remember that our agricultural production is nearly the lowest in the world. We have shown in parts of India that we can increase it a hundredfold. It is true that it is difficult to treat the whole of India on the basis of a model farm; nevertheless, we can achieve the forty or fifty per cent average increase we are aiming at if we apply enough thought and energy. That again, I think, is one of the things that should be made the special work of our community schemes.

Our Community Projects and National Extension Service schemes already cover about 1,30,000 villages in India and they will cover about 50,000 more every year. As the House knows very well, the way these community schemes have functioned is something unique. We have learned from others, certainly, but these schemes have really grown out of the soil of India and therefore they are peculiarly adapted to India. I do not believe in imitating or copying other countries

regardless of conditions in India. These Community Projects and National Extension Service schemes have, I think, created a revolutionary atmosphere in our countryside. I use the word 'revolutionary' in the true sense of the word and not in the bogus sense. That is, they have changed the thinking and the activities of the people. They are pulling them out of the rut of passivity and stagnation in which our villages have lived so long.

Thus far, these Community Projects have aimed at what might be called amenities, like roads, tanks, wells, school buildings and so on. Perhaps that was right, because people should see that their work did produce results. Still, some attention was also paid to food production, and in all the Community Project areas there has been an increase in food production of the magnitude of twenty to twenty-five per cent in the last three years. This is really considerable, if we bear in mind that the workers were not paying very special attention to this aspect.

Now we want them to pay special attention to food production and to the growth of small-scale and cottage industries. That means greater production—industrially and agriculturally. I have no doubt that in the Community Project areas our agricultural production will certainly increase rapidly, and reach at least the forty per cent mark that we propose to lay down for the next five years.

The question of food production may also be viewed from the point of view of the gap in this Plan. If we increase our food production by forty per cent, our gap is filled, or more or less filled, though it does not help our foreign exchange. We may export food even today if we had enough of it. Therefore, all this revolves round how much we can produce in our country.

May I say here that while I am for the public sector growing, I do not understand or appreciate the condemnation of the private sector? The whole philosophy underlying this Plan is to take advantage of every possible way of growth and not to do something which suits some doctrinaire theory or imagine we have grown because we have satisfied some text-book maxim of a hundred years ago. We talk about

nationalization as if nationalization were some kind of a magic remedy for every ill. I believe that ultimately all the principal means of production will be owned by the nation, but I just do not see why I should do something today which limits our progress simply to satisfy some theoretical urge. I have no doubt that at the present stage in India the private sector has a very important task to fulfil, provided always that it works within the confines laid down, and provided always that it does not lead to the creation of monopolies and other evils that the accumulation of wealth gives rise to. I think we have enough power in our laws to keep the private sector in check. We are not afraid of nationalizing anything.

The House knows we have taken some big steps even during the last few months. Only a little while ago, the House was dealing with the Bill concerning insurance. These are all mighty steps and we are not afraid of taking them, but we do not propose to take any step merely to nationalize, unless we think it is profitable to the nation. On the other hand, we would much rather build up new national industries than pay compensation to decrepit industries in order to take charge of them. Why should we, in this age of changing technology, pay to take possession of any old plant unless it happens to serve some strategic purpose? In that case I would do it because I want to hold the strategic points in our economy. I should like the House to appreciate the philosophy behind this report, namely, that the public sector and the private sector should be made to co-operate within the terms and limitations of this Plan.

While the public sector must obviously grow—and even now it has grown, both absolutely and relatively—the private sector is not something unimportant. It will play an important role; though gradually and ultimately it will fade away. But the public sector will control and should control the strategic points in our economy. The private sector, as we have stated in the Industrial Policy Resolution, will be given a fairly wide field subject to the limitations that are laid down. It is for us to decide, from time to time, how to deal with that sector.

The point is that since we are an under-developed country, the scope for industrialization and advance is very

vast. The field, so to speak, is occupied by nobody. Let us advance; let the public sector advance. But why should we spend time and energy over acquiring some old factory or old plant?

As an example, let us take oil. Oil, everyone knows, is of vast importance in the world today. A country that does not produce its own oil is in a weak position, apart from the large amount of money that goes out in foreign exchange in respect of oil. From the point of view of defence, the absence of oil is a fatal weakness. We want to develop our oil resources. The House knows that we are in fact doing it. I cannot guarantee how much oil we shall have in India. All I can say is that the prospects are favourable. If out of the ten places where we have tried we get nothing in seven or eight places but get something in two or three, those two or three will bring us enough returns to cover all the failures, and much more. Therefore, we have to spend money on these things, although it is not a particularly easy matter to find more money. We have to spend it because this work is of vital importance.

Similarly, the machine-making industry is of basic importance. Out of it comes everything else. It is essential that we should develop the machine-making industry as quickly as possible. We are also considering how far and fast we can go in establishing big chemical plants and drug-making plants, all in the public sector. I want this House to realize how vast and unexplored a field lies there for the public sector to occupy, and the public sector is advancing. We do not mind if the private sector advances also, provided that in regard to the basic and strategic things, the public sector holds the field.

There has been some criticism concerning this Plan—and even in the National Development Council a solitary voice was raised—to the effect that it was unfair to certain regions. The complaint was that some railway had not been built in one part of the country, or some factory had not been put up in another part. I should like to say this. First of all, it is admitted that there should be every attempt to make every region and every part of India develop equally in so far

as it can, and that we should remove the disparities that exist in India. Some of our provinces—I need not name them—are very, very poor. They do not deserve poverty. In the British days, other parts were developed. Great cities grew up, not so much as industrial centres, but as ports for exports and for other reasons. We want to remove these disparities. We cannot do it suddenly. It takes time. If in the process of trying to remove the disparities, we really do something which is uneconomic, then we merely add to our burden. There are some plants which can only be started in particular environments. We cannot have an iron and steel plant except where there is iron ore or coal. Such things have to be considered. In regard to most of our major plants, we have appointed committees consisting of our own experts and some foreign experts. They have gone about visiting twenty or thirty places and they have recommended some sites. We have tried our utmost to allot the plants to areas where there are comparatively few industries. But, by and large, we have been unable to ignore the other factors which will make that plant an economic proposition for that area. If we put it in the wrong place, the plant cannot be an economic proposition. If people complain, their complaint is justified in the sense that they are keen to develop their State, but we cannot help it. We cannot help putting up a plant in a place where it will be most successful in terms of production and costs.

How often in this House have criticisms of the public sector come up for discussion! Many wrong things happen, naturally, in big undertakings. Another question arises: how can Parliament control the public sector? Well, one can very well understand the desirability and even the necessity of proper controls, of checks and balances over these vast undertakings on which hundreds of crores of rupees are spent. But there is one other aspect of this question which I should like to place before the House.

The way a government functions is not exactly the way that business houses and enterprises normally function. A government rightly has all kinds of checks, as it deals with public money. Usually it has time to apply these checks. But when one deals with a plant and an enterprise where quick

decisions are necessary, which may make a difference between success and failure, the way a government functions is not sometimes suitable. I have no doubt that the normal governmental procedure applied to a public enterprise of this kind will lead to the failure of that public enterprise. Therefore, we have to evolve a system for working public enterprises where, on the one hand, there are adequate checks and protections, and, on the other, enough freedom for that enterprise to work quickly and without delay. Ultimately it has to be judged by the results, though one cannot judge a government by financial results alone. In judging a big enterprise, one has to judge by the final results.

Suppose a mistake is made, a step is taken which causes loss. Somebody in Parliament will ask: "Who took that step? Why was there loss of lakhs of rupees?" The executive in that plant will never take a step afterwards. He will say, "I shall be hauled up before Parliament." The result will be that there will be no experimentation, no spirit of enterprise left.

It is interesting to see other countries where there are public enterprises; there they have arrived at the conclusion that they must give freedom to the man in charge. Of course, if there is a major loss, if the whole thing goes to pieces, then the man in charge will suffer. But the point is that he is given responsibility. Every person who has advised us, whether he is an American like Dr. Appleby, or a great Russian leader like Mr. Mikoyan, has told us: "Do not interfere with your enterprises; give your executive responsibility, do not interfere." Mr. Mikoyan came to me—you know that the Soviet Union is putting up a steel plant for us which is only at the initial stage yet—and said, "Do not mind my saying this. But if you do not trust your executive and do not give him fuller responsibility, the work will be delayed, and you will suffer." He said, "We have come to the conclusion after considerable experience that we must trust our executives and allow them to go ahead." Of course, there are checks and audit and all that, but checks come afterwards. The chief man on the spot must be able quickly to do what he wants to do.

If we are to go in for public enterprises in a big way in

future, we must realize this fact. We cannot sit down in this House every day and control public enterprises from here. It just cannot be done. Sometimes it may be useful; we save some money. But if we are too insistent we shall lose a great deal of money and the thing will not function rapidly at all, and it will develop a kind of static atmosphere, which is very bad for a growing industry.

I am afraid what I have said, drawing attention to some aspects of this Plan, has been somewhat disjointed. But I would remind the House that although this report may be rather dull reading, its subject is not a dull one; it is an exciting one; it is a vast one, for it concerns the future of India.

PERSONNEL FOR INDUSTRY

IT IS THE TOOL that has made man go ahead, the tool being in effect an extension of his hands and feet. The tool is now becoming an extension of his brain too, because the modern tool is not merely a physical tool but a brain tool. In other words, tools are really an extension of man's capacity to do things. Whether it is fine craftsmanship or big machines or big industry, it is the tool that man has that matters. It is with tools that he can harness steam power or electric power or atomic power, and use Nature's powers with advantage.

The measure of the advance of a community is the type of tools it uses. Tools, of course, can be of all types and tools can be used for good as well as bad purposes. But one must not get his thoughts mixed up and form the idea that a tool is bad when it may happen that a person has not been properly trained or brought up and uses that tool with an evil intention. Atomic energy can be used with enormous advantage and benefit to the world. Atomic energy can also be used for the extermination of humanity. In any event, the progress of humanity can well be judged by the progress of its tool-making

Address to the National Council for Training in Vocational Trades, New Delhi, July 30, 1957

power and the use of tools, whether in small handicrafts or big machines. It is important that human beings should be so conditioned, trained and developed as to use the tool for right purposes and not for wrong. Again if you look at the various countries of the world, those that are called developed and those that are at present undeveloped, the difference is in the use of tools. The advanced countries, using tools, have produced wealth and are wealthier. The production and use of tools inevitably involve the training of persons who may use those and better tools. So, from using what was almost basic, comes the training of human beings in the understanding, in the use, and in the invention of tools. In other words, trained man-power counts in the nation more than anything else, more than gold and silver and money.

A trained human being makes a difference to his country and to the world. The test of a country's advance, broadly speaking, is how many engineers, using the term in a wide sense, it has; because on them will depend the use of advanced techniques. Only the other day, I was looking through an interesting man-power study which our Statistical Institute and the Planning Commission are producing. Thus far we had lists which were not complete or adequate, but now we are trying to approach this problem more scientifically. Unless we know where we are and what we lack, we shall not make progress.

We do not have enough engineers. We have about 30,000 to 40,000 of them in India, which is not enough, in view of our Second Plan and the rest. At the same time, a remarkable fact is that while we do not have enough engineers, there are engineers who are unemployed. Surely there is something organizationally wrong with us that any competent person should be unemployed when we want competent workers. It is a question not only of training people but of seeing that they fit in, that they are assured work, and that the community is assured that it can profit by them. When a person is trained and has no work, it is frustrating for him and wasteful for the community, because training costs the community money. We have to see that the training which we are going to give does not end in a blind lane, but leads to creative and profitable

work. It should not be like the literary training we give now in our universities, which often leads to a dead end, and is a gamble.

We all know that we are passing through a very important and a very difficult period in our national development. We are trying to break through the barrier of a static economy to reach a dynamic and progressive economy. It is always a difficult thing to break that barrier. In this again, it is the trained personnel that counts. The balance in a country like India is changing from the importance attached to pure administrative ability to technical ability of different types. Administrative ability is essential in any organized society but emphasis on mere administrative ability indicates an unprogressive society which wants just to keep things going. We want a highly qualified administrative service, but we want, even more, technical people of all kinds.

A higher technique is better than a lower technique but a higher technique cannot come from the air. It has to grow out of and fit in with the social structure and conditions. Sometimes I find bright young Indian students, who have gone abroad, say, to the United States and have become proficient in some branch of engineering. They come back. They have got so used to higher techniques that they look for them here. They miss them. They are annoyed. They get frustrated. I too want the higher technique to grow up here. But it has to fit in with the physical and social environment. We cannot use something which does not suit us. It is no use hankering after every novel technique. We have sometimes to employ the lower technique. In a country where there is lack of man-power, there is an urgent need for using labour-saving devices. In a country where man-power is abundant, more than abundant, the need for labour-saving devices is not so great. Although labour-saving devices are good and should progressively be employed, they have to be related to the social conditions.

I want to lay stress on the fact that higher techniques must always be aimed at, and that the moment we give up that aim, we accept a position of inferiority in the world. Not only that our freedom itself might be threatened if we use

lower techniques while the world uses higher techniques. Even so, I would again say that in thinking of those higher techniques we shall always have to remember our social problems. Techniques cannot be imposed from outside, they have to grow. India is now being industrialized and will, no doubt, be more and more industrialized. I welcome it; but industrialization is not just an odd placing of, let us say, a high-grade factory in the middle of a desert. With the high-grade factory must grow, within the country, the technical personnel and the machinery it needs.

There is one other aspect which I should like to touch upon. We may be able and technically trained and all that, as individuals, but everything depends on how we pull together. What is the cement that joins us, so that our activities may be advantageous not only to us as individuals but to the community, to the State and to the whole country? As civilization advances and society becomes more and more complex, the element of co-operative endeavour becomes more important. If that element of co-operation is lacking, then all the training that we have is useless because it is frittered away in some measure of conflict. The whole concept of a national State and of national freedom rests on the co-operative endeavour of individuals who live in the State to maintain the freedom and achieve the prosperity of that State. Once this life-giving concept in a society goes, the social fabric disintegrates. Such a society may consist of wonderful people, geniuses in every line, but they will all be geniuses working at cross purposes.

It is a matter of the deepest concern to me that these disruptive tendencies continue to prevail in India. I do not think there is any Indian who lacks a sense of national solidarity, but it is no use having some vague emotional ideas unless one constantly helps national solidarity and unity to grow. We find so many little things and big things happening which indicate that we all forget the nation and descend to sectional and lower levels.

We, in this country, try to do things through peaceful methods in the political, economic and social fields. I do not mean to say that as individuals we are more peaceful or better

or more noble than others. Definitely we are not. I am quite honest about it. Most of us imagine that we are superior because we recite ancient *mantras* about peace and *shanti*. But we are not always peaceful; in conflicts we forget every conception of unity and peace.

Peace is not merely the absence of active violence. It is something more positive. We have experimented with such a positive approach in our political sphere. In spite of our many failings and follies, we succeeded in the experiment, through the genius of our leader and some of our great people. Having made it a success, we seem to forget the very basis of our thinking and action and to drift in wrong directions. Whether it is a question of language or location of an oil refinery, people start breaking heads.

Then look at strikes and the like. I am not an industrial worker or a peasant and I often wonder if, because of that, I can fully grasp or fully enter into the minds of the peasant or the industrial worker. I want to. I try to. At least I keep my mind receptive and open, and I am prepared to recognize that I am wanting in understanding. So I am not prepared to condemn anybody, but nevertheless we have to think about these matters in terms of the nation's good.

It seems to me that this tendency towards industrial conflict, whoever is to blame, employer or employee, is harmful to our growth. I think the worker has an essential right to strike. That is how trade unions have grown and how industrial growth has taken place during the last 100 or 150 years or more in this world. It is a very painful story how the workers were crushed, and how they were gradually able to win rights for themselves. I can very well understand, therefore, their passionate desire to hold on to those privileges and rights that have stood them in good stead in the past. I do not deny them that right; but it is one thing to have an abstract right, and another to exercise it in all circumstances, in all environments, whatever the consequences of a strike. I think that, normally speaking, we have evolved proper methods to deal with industrial disputes. It is for everybody, employer or employee, to realize that it is to nobody's advantage to have strikes.

Today we have to face strikes of public servants, employees of Government, employees in public utility services and the like. This is a much more serious matter because in an industrial enterprise, a strike affects the employees or employers, and only distantly and belatedly does it affect the community in the form of fall in production, but a strike in public services or a public utility affects the community immediately. It cannot, therefore, be judged from the same point of view as an industrial strike. I recognize fully that a government should not think it can decide everything without consultation. A government in a democratic society is a reflection of the will of the people and it should continue to be a reflection of this all the time. Otherwise, it becomes isolated.

We recognize that we are going through a difficult period. Prices have gone up somewhat, though fortunately much less than in many other countries; and when prices go up, especially of the primary materials, people suffer, and it should be our duty to give the most earnest consideration to these problems and try to remove the increasing burdens on our people. We have been considering these matters. But let us realize also that there is no magic remedy to these problems. We are paying the cost of trying to go ahead. It may be that here and there we make mistakes; we try to remedy them. But we do not remedy a mistake by getting into some greater error. Therefore it distresses me to see many of our fellow countrymen talk loosely of strikes in services essential to the community. Even if they feel that many of their demands are right, such strikes are wrong and thoughtless. In the final analysis, they are anti-social and anti-national.

Let us consider their difficulties with sympathy, but let us rule out the use of the big club on the part of both Government and workers. Whenever the big club is wielded by Government, I consider it a failure of Government to that extent. It does no credit to a government to have to use the big club. It does no credit to the people either to have to use the big club. These questions cannot be settled or dealt with by threats or counter-threats. These are matters which affect the whole country, and affect, again, the Five-Year Plan. People should know, if they have their eyes open and see what

is happening in the world, that India is facing dangers—not only internal difficulties but external dangers too. For our countrymen at this moment to talk light-heartedly of embarking on big strikes is a matter which is most distressing to me and it shows that somehow we have not grown mature enough to shoulder the heavy responsibilities that this country imposes. If we are not mature enough, if we are not united enough, if we do not know what comes first and what comes next, then all our planning and our technical training will yield little fruit.

THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS

THE TWO HOUSES

I GRAVE YOUR LEAVE, Sir, and the indulgence of the House, to refer to certain incidents which took place in this House as well as the other House in the course of the last week, and which somewhat disturbed the normal serenity of the work of Parliament. Unfortunately I was not here then, but since my return, I have endeavoured to acquaint myself fully with what happened in both the Houses of Parliament.

Under our Constitution, Parliament consists of our two Houses, each functioning in the allotted sphere laid down in that Constitution. We derive authority from that Constitution. Sometimes we refer back to the practice and conventions prevailing in the Houses of Parliament of the United Kingdom and even refer erroneously to an Upper House and a Lower House. I do not think that is correct. Nor is it helpful always to refer back to the procedure of the British Parliament which has grown up in the course of several hundred years and as a result of conflicts originally with the authority of the King and later between the Commons and the Lords. We have no such history behind us, though in making our Constitution we have profited by the experience of others. Our guide must, therefore, be our own Constitution which has clearly specified the functions of the House of the People (Lok Sabha) and the Council of States (Rajya Sabha). To call either of these Houses an Upper House or a Lower House is not correct. Each House has full authority to regulate its own procedure within the limits of the Constitution. Neither House, by itself, constitutes Parliament. It is the two Houses together that make the Parliament of India.

The successful working of our Constitution, as of any

democratic structure, demands the closest co-operation between the two Houses. They are, in fact, parts of the same structure and any lack of that spirit of co-operation and accommodation would lead to difficulties and come in the way of the proper functioning of our Constitution. It is, therefore, peculiarly to be regretted that any sense of conflict should arise between the two Houses. For those who are interested in the success of the great experiment in nation-building that we have embarked upon, it is a paramount duty to bring about this close co-operation and respect for each other. There can be no constitutional differences between the two Houses, because the final authority is the Constitution itself. That Constitution treats the two Houses equally, except in certain financial matters which are to be the sole purview of the House of the People. In regard to what these are, the Speaker is the final authority.

This position is perfectly clear and cannot be and has not been challenged at any stage. Unfortunately, some words were used by my colleague, the Law Minister, in speaking in the Council of States on April 29, which led to a misunderstanding. That misunderstanding could have been easily removed by a direct reference to him. This was not done and the matter was raised in the House. Further misunderstandings then arose as between the two Houses and questions of privilege were raised and it was stated that the dignity of this House had been affected.

All of us are zealous of maintaining the dignity and authority of this House and of the Speaker who represents this House. Indeed, all of us are anxious to maintain the dignity and authority of both Houses which constitute Parliament. My colleague, the Law Minister, is as anxious as any of us to maintain that dignity and authority and it has been a matter of the greatest regret to him that any words of his should have led people to believe otherwise and further led to certain occurrences in both Houses which disturbed for a while the co-operative and friendly atmosphere which must of necessity prevail in both Houses of Parliament. Owing to some of these occurrences, he was placed in an embarrassing position, where to carry out the directions of one House might

appear as if he had ignored the directions of the other. In this dilemma he might have produced an impression of not having shown the usual consideration which is the duty of every Member. But that was far from his intention and he regrets it and trusts that the House will accept his apology for any mistake which he might have inadvertently committed.

So far as the facts are concerned, they are clear, although unfortunately my colleague, the Law Minister, was not aware of all of them at the time the first reference was made to this matter in the Council of States. It is clear and beyond possibility of dispute that the Speaker's authority is final in declaring that a Bill is a Money Bill. When the Speaker gives his certificate to this effect, this cannot be challenged. The Speaker has no obligation to consult anyone in coming to a decision or in giving his certificate. But he has himself decided to ask for the opinion of the Law Ministry in every case that has arisen since the commencement of the Constitution in 1950, before he records his decision. In the present case, namely, the Indian Income-Tax (Amendment) Bill, when the Bill was first received, the Law Ministry advised that it was a Money Bill. It was subsequently referred to the Select Committee and thereafter considered by the House of the People on April 23, 1953. The Speaker raised the question himself as to whether the Bill as amended by the Select Committee was a Money Bill and directed that the Law Ministry be approached and asked again to re-examine the position as also to give the grounds on which they think that the Bill was a Money Bill. The Ministry of Law replied on April 24, 1953, saying that the Bill as passed by the Select Committee was a Money Bill and gave reasons for their advice. Thereupon the Speaker came to the decision on April 25, 1953, that the Bill as passed by the House of the People was a Money Bill and later signed the certificate embodying this decision.

It will be observed that every care was taken by the Speaker to seek the advice of the Law Ministry at various stages, although there was no obligation on him to do so. Unfortunately, the Law Minister himself, though undoubtedly responsible for the advice of his Ministry, was not

aware of these references at that time. As soon as the Law Minister became aware of them on April 30, he brought these facts to the notice of the Chairman of the Council of States.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE JUNGLE

IT HAS BECOME a common practice with us—this applies to me also to some extent—to organize gala functions at a time when we should all be absorbed in work of great magnitude. A lot of effort goes into pomp and show and very little into work. We exhibit ourselves as though we were some commodity. This is true of all organizations, governmental and non-governmental.

In Delhi, nowadays, there are any number of conferences—so many that one does not find time even to breathe. Of course, I too attend several of them because I am very much interested. How I wish silence would prevail in Delhi for some days and all the conferences would be stopped!

New Delhi is a jungle, a jungle of able men; still a jungle. You are lost in this jungle of administrative mazes and labyrinths because there are thousands of offices and roads. It is for scientists to examine this problem and suggest remedies. True, the activities of a growing nation must expand, but how and in what direction should they expand? The child grows and looks handsome only when the body grows proportionately with the hands and feet. If the hands alone grow and not the feet, the child looks defective. That would apply to government offices also.

In India, as in any other country of the world, there is a great need for engineers, and as our plans and schemes materialize, we shall be needing more and more engineers. Why only engineers? We need teachers also in great number, but we cannot recruit them straightaway. As our educational development plans mature, we shall be needing lakhs of

Inaugural address at the 24th annual meeting of the Central Board of Irrigation and Power, New Delhi, October 26, 1953

teachers. Unless we foresee even now what we need after two or five years, we cannot plan in such a way that we have enough of trained men to teach after two or five years. There are difficulties and bottlenecks in any undertaking. We have to improve and extend our health services but we cannot achieve this by merely planning on paper. Even money, which is required in large amounts, will not help us achieve such expansion. It can be done only by having a sufficient number of experienced men who have had sound training. But it takes time to acquire experience. Whether it be engineering or medicine or any other profession, one has to learn and work hard to gain the necessary experience. Therefore, if we plan to extend our health services in the next five years, we must begin getting prepared for it right now, so that we have the requisite number of qualified doctors after five years. Training and experience are as essential for an engineer as for a doctor or a health officer. It will be risky to entrust a responsible task to an engineer who does not know his work. It can result in a lot of damage. The country can sustain small losses but losses in works of great magnitude cannot be tolerated because their repercussions will be serious and injurious. You know very well that if we undertake construction of a large dam somewhere and if by some reason of neglect or inexperience the dam gives way at a future date, it will result in untold loss to the country. Not only will it be a great monetary loss, but it will also create misery and ruin. Therefore, in such works, it is not enough if we have men with mere academic degrees. We should have men with ripe experience who would not commit mistakes even inadvertently. Their eyes should ever be vigilant and their hands ever ready to work. But it takes time to have such men, as proper and thorough training is needed.

This leads us to the obvious conclusion that, whatever be our plan, we must keep one fundamental point in view : how best to train and equip our men properly, be they engineers or doctors or teachers or members of any other important profession, so that we may have men with training and experience when we need their services. Though this applies to all fields it is more essential in scientific and technical activities. In

these fields we cannot even allow slips to occur because slips can cause disaster. And if we do not train our men properly it means only two things : either the work will have to be entrusted to second- or third-rate men or we shall have to depend upon the trained personnel of other countries. I agree, of course, that in India the number of engineers is smaller than our requirements but even then the number is large enough. We should endeavour to increase their number and give them opportunities for better training. Our country has produced a good number of engineers of high calibre and some of them have achieved international reputation. We have ultimately to depend upon our own men in engineering as well as other fields. Opportunity for further training, if necessary, should be given to them so that we have a large number of engineers of high quality. We may have foreign men if we must, under extraordinary circumstances, because we should never allow work to suffer. A big undertaking can be completely ruined by employing an inexperienced Indian in preference to a highly experienced foreigner. If we are in doubt whether we have the requisite experience for an important project I have no hesitation in employing an experienced foreigner; because, first, the work will not be mishandled, and secondly, our men will have the opportunity of getting training and gaining experience.

There is a weakness in our country—a tendency to look to the sky and stars for guidance and to try to foresee the future by astrology. Blessed be those who are so interested! But our work lies in visualizing the future of our country not by looking to the stars and basing our calculations on their movements but by assessing our strength, resources and means and knowing how best to use them. Several factors and efforts go to the making and developing of our country but the engineers, probably, have the most active role to play. For they have the largest share in the execution of any plan.

The Chairman has raised a few questions with regard to the fact that while formerly engineers used to be Secretaries to the Government, they are no longer so now. I have no objection to engineers being Secretaries to the Government, but I object to those who are specially qualified for a particular

profession sitting in the office, quill-driving. I consider it a waste of their talents, knowledge and experience. Enough persons are available in India who can use their pens well in the office, but the number of good engineers is inadequate. Why is it so?

This is because, for some reason or other, we have classified people according to the position occupied by them in their official life and we consider one class better than the other. Everybody desires to go to the upper class. But the irony of it is that such classification and gradation itself is absurd. You all know Einstein. He is working as a professor in an American university and is engaged in research work there. But how many of you, may I ask, know the name of the principal of that university? You do not know it. You do not even know the name of the highest officer of that university, but you know the name of one of its professors because of his exceptionally brilliant work. It is plain that according to the rules and regulations the head of the university is the superior of that professor. But in the eyes of the world Einstein is a much greater man, one whose name will be remembered not only now but long after his death.

Our services are steeped in a system of gradation or caste system which is probably the legacy of British rule. One could explain such a classification in the old system because it was the very basis of administration. All persons in the employment of Government were under the Viceroy, who was supreme, and perhaps such an arrangement was suited to those times. Such a pattern is totally out of place in the present set-up and conditions. But the pity of it is that people's minds still cling to the old system. It is possible that a renowned, first-class engineer might be much more needed by us than any of our Secretaries. Secretaries are available in abundance but engineers are few. It may be that though the engineer is working in his own sphere, yet in official status the Secretary is in a way his superior. This is just a gradation. Whereas engineers have a reputation all over the world, the Secretaries are not known to anyone outside Delhi. What I am driving at is that it is a wrong way to assess a man's worth by the salary drawn by him or the designation attached to his post.

Such a notion does not appeal to me because, as you know, I entered the administration at quite an advanced age. Whatever I learnt about assessing a man's worth had nothing to do with his salary, with his dress or with his house. All my life I have gauged people from altogether a different angle, and I still believe in the same method. It is possible that I may consider a peon with more pride and respect than his own officer, and I do not see any flaw in it. Essentially, respect is due for work and not for the salary drawn. A man may be a famous poet, but his income may be meagre; still, he should and will be respected much more than officers drawing high salaries. In short, the idea of money being made a yardstick for assessing a man's worth has clouded the issue and created confusion. The practice of grading people according to their status in official capacity should go.

As I told you earlier, the need for engineers will increase day by day in India, nay, in the world. By engineer I mean a worker. An engineer who sits in the office and does not know how to work with his own hands is useless. However big an officer he might be, and whatever his age, he should be retired. The test for engineers should be whether they are working with their own hands or not. An engineer becomes useless and reaches the stage of retirement when he begins to desire a comfortable office chair merely to issue orders. I would say that I want all people, whether engineers or non-engineers, to possess an engineering approach to the problems facing them. The scientific approach means that a person has a systematic way of thinking and arrives at the reality by reasoning. The engineering approach would be a scientific approach coupled with the urge for creation, the urge to make and produce new things for the common good. When the people of a country have such an approach to their problems then that country progresses. For this to happen, it is not necessary that all people should study engineering but it is essential that all should have the proper approach to their problems.

In your address you have covered a wide range of problems and thrown light on some of them. I do not propose to talk about all of them today. I shall content myself by saying that

our future status amongst the nations, and the good name of our country, will depend entirely upon our work and work alone. Of course, we have big achievements. Our river valley projects like Bhakra-Nangal, Damodar, Hirakud and Tungabhadra will remain landmarks for ever. Even as we have undertaken these gigantic projects we have successfully to complete thousands of smaller projects in a planned way. We must remember that in all our undertakings we must carry with us our people and keep them well informed. Wherever there are labourers working under you, in a village or town, confide in them; only then can big works be done well. It thrills one to feel that one is engaged in a great and useful work. The same thrill should also be felt by the masses.

Now let me warn you against one pitfall. I see a strange maldevelopment in the country and it conjures up before me a figure of a man five feet tall but with arms four feet long. The way Government organizations and departments multiply leads us nowhere but to waste. With the growth of offices arises the problem of co-ordination between them. A co-ordinating agency is created and, as usual, its size also goes on increasing. Then arises the problem of how to co-ordinate the activities of the co-ordinating agencies. All this is at once baffling and amusing. If it is not stopped, I tell you, the head will remain small while the body will go on increasing in size. Such maldevelopment of organizations is dangerous to our country. It means that quality will suffer and quantity will increase.

In a few days I shall be going to Bihar and flying over the areas recently devastated by the floods there. I shall also talk to the engineers of that State. Though I have read enough details of the havoc created by the floods, I shall have a better idea seeing the affected places with my own eyes. You know that many things have been under active consideration about the Kosi for many years and probably some action has also been decided upon. I am glad to know that schemes are to be taken in hand to prevent floods in River Gandak.

The floods in Bihar are a major problem needing careful study on scientific and engineering lines. We should know

how to tackle this problem. I am not prepared to admit that we are helpless. Floods are governed by natural phenomena which can be studied. We should carefully study the rainfall during the last forty to fifty years. What are the meteorological reports that we have? What do they say? What cycles of floods are mentioned therein? When do high floods occur and when low floods? These require careful study. We have had the Meteorological Department for more than a hundred years. Recently the Department celebrated its centenary, and we have data and figures collected for the last hundred years. We should examine all these data relating to floods, study the hydrology from every angle and arrive at some conclusions as to when floods occur and what their causes and cyclic periods are. This is the scientific approach to the problem. What we have been doing is that when there are floods we run shovel in hand to pile up earth to prevent floods. That is not a scientific or planned approach.

I do not want that a big office should be opened forthwith for these studies and that a hundred or fifty men should take a whole year to decide what staff is necessary, that there should be elaborate application forms for recruitment and that senior members of the Public Service Commission should then start considering them. That will mean that it will take three years for a decision to be taken on who should be appointed to the organization. This is not a matter to be so delayed. The proper thing would be to form a small unit consisting of a few engineers who should select a particular area, whether in Bihar or in Bombay, and study its hydrology and its effects. Only those areas where there is immediate necessity, and not the whole of India, should be taken up for such study. Instead of going about in this businesslike way, we wander aimlessly and plan big schemes for studying hydrology. India being so vast a country, it will be proposed that there should be one Director-General of Hydrology. Then we will think how many Deputy Directors-General should be under him. Next we will think about Assistant Directors-General. Then we will think of some high officers or an inspector above all these people. The aim is to evolve a reasonable scheme! We then require accommodation, both

for office and residences. Where will the Director-General of such a big office live? Again, there will be proposals for a Secretary, Joint Secretary, Deputy Secretary, Assistant Secretary and so on. Two to three years will be taken up this way in deciding these proposals. When these proposals are ready, we would have forgotten what we started all this for. This is strange and funny. In Delhi, you would have noticed, there are no Directors—all are Directors-General! We feel that the bigger the designation, the higher our status.

I have spent my life in quite a different sphere. It is six years since I have been in this office and yet I fail to understand what this affair is. I do not want you to convert the whole population of India into Directors-General. I want you to conserve your energies, to take up only one area at a time. Plan for this area, with the material that is with you; and after planning for this area, then take up another. I do not want a big officer to come to me and say: we have to do this and that, we want so much staff, we want so many peons because our status is so high that each should have three or four *chaprasis*. I have neither any complaint nor any grudge against peons. They are very good men. But as long as this practice of getting the work done through peons lasts, Delhi will not get out of the old rut. The new age will dawn only when there are no *chaprasis*. Nobody wants to walk even to the neighbouring room. Even in this age of telephones everybody wants to send messages through peons. Maybe, we might need a couple of messenger boys, but surely not a big crowd of peons. I have heard that before the war there were only 3,200 peons here in Delhi but now this number has increased to 10,000. No doubt the work has somewhat increased but the pomp has increased much more. The poor *chaprasis* do work and they are not to blame. Nor do I mean to dispense with them. But I am against the mentality of those who sit in their rooms, press the button and want the peon to come. Maybe, they would have just two steps to take, but they won't like to go and personally discuss a matter for five minutes. They won't even talk on the telephone. They would write long notes and send them to the other man because each has his own room. What is this method of working? This

way not only will no work be done, but we shall be wasting time and money. We have to adopt an entirely different way. This is a very important aspect, and requires deep consideration. Much work can be done without any pomp and creation of big departments.

If you examine your problems in this manner, I am confident you will be successful in your projects. On the engineers of India rests a great responsibility and you have to show how you shoulder it.

PRIVATE PROPERTY AND PUBLIC GOOD

THE HOUSE will remember that when this matter came up on the earlier motion to appoint a Joint Committee, we had a fairly full and profitable discussion in this House. As a result, the House agreed to send this Bill to a Joint Committee. The other House went a step further and unanimously agreed to send it to the Joint Committee. I mention these facts to show what a great degree of unanimity of opinion there has been in Parliament over this matter.

One would imagine sometimes, reading or hearing some criticisms made outside this House, that this was a measure over which opinion was rent in twain, that it was a highly controversial measure which proposed something very extraordinary. Yet, when one comes to see what has actually happened in this House or the other House, one finds that the persons who are most intimately connected with this matter, in the sense that they are considering it directly, Members of the two Houses, who have listened to arguments for and against, have come to one broad conclusion—in favour of this amendment of the Constitution. This should be remembered because an attempt is made—outside Parliament, of course—to create a contrary impression.

I am not saying anything secret when I say that the

Speech in Lok Sabha on Bill to amend Article 31 (2) of the Constitution, April 11, 1955

proceedings of the Joint Committee were remarkable for their co-operative approach to this problem. It was an understanding approach and a near-unanimous approach. In fact, the Bill, as it has emerged from the Joint Committee, might almost be considered to represent the views of almost every member of the Joint Committee, which consisted of people of various parties and various views.

After the report of the Joint Committee was prepared and passed in this co-operative manner by almost every Member of the Joint Committee, some Minutes of Dissent have been received. They are three, I think, one by Shri Chatterjee, one by Shri Jaipal Singh and one by Shrimati Chakravartty and others.

We might presume that Shri Jaipal Singh had erred in ignorance in presenting his Minute of Dissent. If he had discussed the matter with us, he might have been convinced of the contrary.

Then there is the Minute of Dissent of Shrimati Chakravartty and two other hon. Members. I think that anyone who reads it will probably come to the conclusion that this is what might be called a formal Minute of Dissent, without much faith or belief behind it. They say at the beginning of the Minute of Dissent that they feel that they have been returned to this House on a programme of acquisition without compensation. But that certainly is not the basis of this Bill or the policy of Government.

Now we come to the major and the longest Minute of Dissent, that of the hon. Member Shri N. C. Chatterjee, in which he has quoted from high legal authorities, apart from the fact that he is himself a high legal authority. First of all we must bear in mind exactly what this Bill is and what this attempt to amend the Constitution is. It is odd that words like confiscation of property and expropriation are thrown about when actually what the Constitution—or the amended Constitution, if you amend it—says is that there will be no such thing except by law and except on payment of compensation. The quantum of compensation is to be determined by the legislature. Shri Chatterjee has given many quotations about due process of law. For instance he says a distinguished

American judge has observed : "A great desire to improve the public condition is not enough to warrant achieving the desire by a shorter cut than the constitutional way."

I say that this is the constitutional way, and what is proposed is the definite, legal and constitutional way of doing it and we are varying or amending the Constitution in the constitutional way. I do not quite understand this throwing about of words like expropriation and confiscation and doing things apart from the law. Remember that the sole major change proposed is to make clear one thing which was clear to us at the time this Constitution was framed. That is to say, according to the Constitution as it emerged from the Constituent Assembly, the quantum of compensation or the principles governing compensation would be decided by the legislature. This was made perfectly clear. It is obvious that those who framed the Constitution failed in giving expression to their wishes accurately and precisely, and thereby, the Supreme Court and some other Courts have interpreted it in a different way. The Supreme Court is the final authority for interpreting the Constitution. All I can say is that the Constitution was not worded as precisely as the framers of the Constitution intended. What the framers of the Constitution intended is there for anyone to see. All that has been done now is to make that wording more precise and more in accordance with what the framers of the Constitution at that time meant and openly said. I do not therefore understand this measure of excitement and agitation in people's minds—not in this House but elsewhere—about this matter.

May I say straightaway that I think, with all respect, that the Joint Committee has certainly improved the Bill from what it was previously? I accept this Report and the recommendations completely. There might be one or two minor changes that we might agree to—we have one or two minor changes in view—but apart from that, I think that it would be a pity to amend this as it has emerged from the Joint Committee's consideration. It has emerged, as the House will see, in a much simpler form. It is shorter and simpler than before and that itself is desirable. The slight change in Article 31(2) makes the point clear and as a consequence of that

change, it has not been necessary to add a long list of matters in the third clause.

Shri Chatterjee has written at length and has begun by referring to the makers of the Indian Constitution having deliberately conferred certain Fundamental Rights. I was one of those humble individuals who had something to do with the making of the Constitution; there are others sitting here who had recorded their views then. I submit that the makers of the Constitution were perfectly clear as to what they meant. What we are putting before the House in this Joint Committee's Report, I submit, is precisely and exactly what they said at that time, so far as Article 31(2) is concerned. There is nothing new about it and there is nothing very terrible about it. The whole Constitution is based on the proposition that we must proceed by law and, secondly, that compensation should be paid, except in a certain small number of specified cases. Generally speaking, compensation must be paid, but the determination of what the compensation should be is left to the legislature. To repeat what I said four or five years ago, if anything is done by the legislature which is considered a fraud on the Constitution, then the courts may come in, but otherwise it should not be open to the courts to challenge the decision of the legislature on this point. It is a simple issue. Where does expropriation come in? I really do not understand it. The view in regard to property which Shri Chatterjee has put forward in his Minute of Dissent, and in which he is supported by some high legal authorities, is one with which I cannot agree. It may be that, as Shri Chatterjee says, quoting a great political thinker, "men will sooner forget the death of their relatives than the confiscation of their property". We would rather not encourage such men in this country. It is a monstrous thing that property should be made a god, above human beings. To say that whatever a man may do—he may even commit murder—is nothing, but property is a god and must be worshipped, is a view of property which Government is not prepared to accept at all.

Shri Chatterjee repeatedly refers to the use of the phrase "the sanctity of private property", as though there was something divine or semi-divine about it. The possession of property

is a right which we recognize, which we protect, and it is defined here how compensation is to be given if a man is deprived of it. But to talk in terms of sanctity, divinity and so on being attached to property is very much out of date. It has no relation to present-day facts. If Shri Chatterjee quotes something from the judges of the middle of the nineteenth century, I will only say that that may have been the way of thinking then, but that it is not so now.

Again, Shri Chatterjee quotes—rather, he quotes someone who quotes—an eminent English jurist as having said that “the public good is in nothing more essentially interested than in the protection of private property”. I should like the House to consider these words. That is what I call an astounding and amazing statement—that the highest public good is the protection of private property, more than everything else. I submit that we should not only not agree to it but reject it summarily and absolutely, whoever might have made it.

Shri Chatterjee goes on to say that no one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property. I agree completely. Who is doing so? Is this arbitrary deprivation of property? First, the law does not do it. Secondly, the law lays down rules and regulations on the principles of compensation. Where does arbitrariness come in? I regret to say some people do not see what is being done. There are even some people who write in newspapers without understanding the purport. They talk loosely and use words like expropriation, confiscation and arbitrary action. There is nothing of the kind.

Shri Chatterjee has referred to the United States Constitution in this respect. The United States Constitution is a great document, but I do not think it is quite appropriate to compare it with our Constitution or to say that our Constitution is based on it. Of course, we have taken a good many things from it and many more things from the Constitution of the United Kingdom. Nevertheless, our Constitution is not the Constitution of the United Kingdom, or, much less, that of the United States. The United States Constitution dates back to some time in the eighteenth century. It is obviously not a recent document. It represents the idea of



*Speaking at the foundation-laying ceremony of the Tata
Institute of fundamental Research, Bombay, January 1954*

*The gathering at Nangal at the opening
of the Bhakra Main Canal, July 1954*






*Addressing the first meeting of the Board of Co-ordination
on River Valley Projects, New Delhi, October 1954*



*With Dr. Ho Chi-Minh, President of the
Democratic Republic
of Viet Nam, Hanoi,
October 1954*

*Going round the Forbidden City in Peking, with
his daughter, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, October 1954*





With Mr. Mao Tse-tung Chairman of the People's Republic of China, in Peking, October 1954

Being interviewed for the British Broadcasting Corporation in New Delhi, November 1954





Receiving Lt.-Col. Gamal Abdel Nasser (centre), Prime Minister of Egypt, at Palam airport, New Delhi, April 1955



At Bandung, Indonesia, with U Nu, Prime Minister of Burma, at the time of the Afro-Asian Conference, April 1955

the fathers of the American Constitution and the American nation at that time and they produced a very fine document, but for us to consider it in another country, in India, in the middle of the twentieth century, is hardly a reasonable proposition.

I should therefore like Parliament to remember these basic things. Here is something that is proposed which in effect clarifies and elucidates the Constitution and brings it completely in line with what the makers of the Constitution intended. Unfortunately, they did not do so in clear enough language, and therefore the courts have interpreted it differently. So, first, it is a matter of elucidation. Secondly, it is wrong to say that we are suggesting any arbitrary action, any confiscatory action or any expropriatory action. In fact, the Constitution has said that there should be compensation by law. But it is true that the quantum of compensation will be determined by the legislature. I cannot say offhand what in a particular case the legislature might do. But, by and large, if you have to govern this country democratically, you have to trust the legislature not only in this but in a hundred other matters of far greater moment. This legislature might decide on some far-reaching change affecting, perhaps, a question of such magnitude as war and peace. Surely the Supreme Court will not decide that. It may decide other questions in ways which directly or indirectly might even affect property. All kinds of decisions may be taken which will have a powerful effect on our social and economic structure, and, for example, on planning. But it is the legislature's will that is bound to prevail in such matters. There is no way out of it. It seems to me a basically wrong approach to single out this question of compensation and to take it out of the purview of the legislature in the sense of somebody else revising the legislature's decision. Such a course can be thought of only if you think that property is something semi-divine and that the protection of private property is to the largest good of the nation, which hardly anyone today will say, obviously.

I do not know how I can deal with these fears and apprehensions. There is no remedy for fear except the absence of fear. Today, in the larger world context, nations are afraid,

and because they are afraid they often say and do the wrong things. Things thus get worse. I do not know what we shall do about it in the international sphere. Some people in this country, and some outside, have all manner of apprehensions. Sometimes it is said: "Well, it is all right in the present Parliament but what about other Parliaments?" In fact, Shri Chatterjee himself has hinted darkly at the picture of the time when this Government may be no more. I am glad that Shri Chatterjee appreciates the virtues and value of this Government. For us to think what may happen at a distant future is not a very useful or profitable occupation at any time, much less at the moment when the world is in a transitional stage. Even if we manage to escape big wars, other changes are taking place which are altering the structure of society, just as the Industrial Revolution came about and changed the whole relationship of human beings. The idea of property changes with the coming of the technological revolution.

In this transitional age, to think in a static way and to imagine that property has exactly the same place in human life as it used to have means that we have stopped thinking. These apprehensions and fears therefore appear to me completely unjustified. Far greater developments and disasters might suddenly confront the world and in this context for somebody to be afraid of some mill or plant or factory being acquired seems to me out of proportion. So far as this Government is concerned, my mind is perfectly clear on the subject. I have no respect for property, except perhaps some personal belongings. But I respect the other person's respect for property occasionally. The House will forgive me if I speak in a personal sense; I have no property sense. It seems a burden to me to carry property; it is a nuisance. In life's journey one should be lightly laden; one cannot be tied down to a patch of land or a building. I cannot appreciate this intense attachment to property. But, while not appreciating it, I realize and recognize its prevalence. At the same time I think the proposition that some hon. Members on the opposite side advanced about acquisition or confiscation without compensation seems to me basically wrong. I say so

from the point of view of the public good, not because I love property. Except in particular cases, where a person misbehaves and so on, I do not want anything to be acquired except on payment of just compensation.

I need not refer to foreign capital here. I am surprised to hear the proposal being put forward repeatedly that we must confiscate or expropriate foreign capital. I cannot imagine anything more thoughtless and unrealistic; it has no relation to reality. No country, whether it is socialist or communist or of any other type, can do it, except in the thunder of war or revolution when things happen not because of law or policy but because of historical forces. I am quite certain that the Soviet Union will never do it in regard to any foreign capital that may be there; it will not do it because international relations will be affected. No country wants to spoil its international relations or its credit in the world by doing this kind of thing in order to save a few crores or a few millions in money.

Soviet Russia, leaving the Revolution aside, has had dealings with other countries and it has developed a reputation of always honouring its word—financial word. Other European countries have not done so sometimes, but the Soviet Union has. It is very careful about preserving that reputation. Let us not therefore pursue this talk of expropriating foreign capital; it is not worth it. We are not such a poor country as to go about indulging in tactics which will lose us the goodwill and the credit of the world, and which will, perhaps, leave a feeling of wrong-doing in our minds and hearts.

Even inside our own country, we cannot think of schemes and policies in isolation. We deal, for example, with the zamindari system and other schemes relating to land. What are referred to as schemes of social engineering cannot often be dealt with in the normal way of acquisition of land or property. We cannot acquire the whole land at once. We have to go about it gradually. We have to find out about our capacity to pay. And then the payment can be graded. That is: when we acquire the property, as we did in the case of zamindars, the relatively poor zamindar gets full

compensation, a hundred per cent. Another person may get about 80 per cent, the third 70 and the fourth 60. There is no trouble there. But let us look at the industrial and business ventures. We are acquiring the Imperial Bank. So far as I know, we are paying pretty full compensation, in whatever form it may be. By not doing so, we may save a little money here and there, but it will injure us. It will be even more wrong in the case of the small owners not to give them full compensation. I am surprised that one of these Minutes of Dissent hints that we are out to harm the small owner. I submit that it is an unfair charge. Nobody can do it; how can we—this Parliament? Or this Government? Can anybody conceive of this Parliament or any other legislature going out to harm the small owner? The self-interest of the average Member will shout out against such a step, if nothing else.

Coming to industrial property, our approach is that the Government should never acquire any old plant except for the purpose of holding some strategic point for the benefit of planning. The reasons behind this approach are obvious. We are an under-developed country, industrially speaking; we want to industrialize the country; we want hundreds of factories to go up. Should I not use all the resources available at my hand to put up new factories—State factories—instead of acquiring old and perhaps worn-out plants belonging to somebody else?

We are not going to acquire anything unless it comes in the way of our planning. The idea which is sometimes put forward by some honourable Members opposite, that a kind of general scheme of nationalization would bring about great equalization, is incorrect. Drastic equalization in that way simply means equalization of the lowest stage of poverty. That is not good enough. We want to raise our country's standards and yet bring about this equalization, so that we can go towards an egalitarian society. The whole idea of nationalization does not come into the picture at all except that when planning requires that some strategic point which comes in its way should be taken possession of, the State should control it. Otherwise the State should go ahead and build up new State plants. The public sector becomes bigger and more and

more important and productive, letting the private sector advance simultaneously. If the public sector is nibbling and eating into the private sector, there is no total advance, even though there might be some advantage from the social point of view. We shall only be losing our resources by shifting a factory from the private to the public sector.

The House will forgive me if I often talk about atomic energy. I do that because I wish people to realize how the whole basis of our future industrial living pattern may be affected. I have no doubt that just as we were affected by the advent of steam and electric power, the advent of atomic power in the next ten, fifteen or twenty years, will make a vast difference to the running of all our factories. This is another reason why we should not go about wasting national resources in mere acquisition of property when we can build other plants which are more modern.

And if we have to acquire property we should pay just and equitable compensation. There may be many rich men owning these interests but many of these large properties are limited liability companies with a large number of shareholders. We do not wish to deprive them. I therefore say again that all this apprehension is completely misplaced. It ignores not only existing conditions in India but the probable future line of advance.

We talk about a socialist pattern of society, industrialization, the removing of unemployment, of higher standards, and so on. What is really necessary is somehow to activize and dynamize the base of the Indian social structure. I want the House to appreciate this phrase. No doubt there must be approaches from the top, but there has been too much activizing from the top layers of society all the time. We do not solve our problems unless we activize the base of Indian society, which means millions and millions of villagers, millions of workers and small earners, unemployed people and people on the land. They are the base of Indian society. By grappling with the problem from the top, we may gradually draw people away from those lower layers into the middle layers, but the base is not really affected. Once we activize it and make it dynamic, the progress of India will be rapid.

If I may, with all respect, refer to Gandhiji, his view was always to activize the lowest strata. We need not now go into how we should do it. The thinking of many of our leading people is that dynamism somehow starts from the top and seeps to the bottom. I think that outlook must change. To activize this base we may have to take numerous social steps like narrowing the big gap between the top and the bottom. That is the right approach. Acquiring property or depriving somebody of his property, or thinking that we are doing good to the country by not paying compensation will not help.

So I would plead with this House that this particular amendment of the Constitution removes a slight obstacle that had come in our way, and clears the path for us to go ahead with the vast schemes of development that we shall have to undertake.

PARTIES IN INDIA

REMEMBER THIS, that we are still the children of the Indian Revolution. That revolution was a peaceful one. Nevertheless, it was a revolution, and it formed and moulded the Indian people for a generation or two. We have not ceased to be revolutionaries.

You know, broadly, what our Government stands for, and what our national organization, the Congress, stands for. Now, where do these other organizations come in, whose chief function seems to be to attack the Government and attack the Congress? I don't mind attacks. I want our people to be wide awake and not complacent. I want their minds to be alert, keen as a razor's edge. So I am not afraid of attacks or criticism. But I do want to understand what exactly these organizations, the Socialist, Praja Socialist, Communist, stand for. We may leave out the communalists because they stand for nothing at all. They are only a relic of some ancient

period. They are neither in the past nor in the present and they are hung in mid-air. India tolerates everybody and everything including madmen, and they also exist and carry on. So we may ignore the communalists. But let us not forget that their trend of thought is a dangerous trend. It is a separatist trend. It is a disruptive trend. It is a trend full of hatred. It is a trend that is bad for India today. If we maintain this kind of communalism, whether it is Hindu or Muslim or Christian or Sikh or any other, India will cease to be what it is. It will go to pieces. So let us put aside these communal parties.

We have these other parties, the Socialist, the Praja Socialist, and the Communist. Where exactly do they stand? I have often tried to find out where the Socialists stand. Unfortunately they have got so accustomed to the use of strong language that it is difficult to find out any meaning in that language. It is just strong language. The Socialists generally live in a state of extreme frustration and are angry with the world because the world doesn't listen to them. India doesn't listen to them. I am very sorry I can't make India listen to them. I wish them prosperity. I wish them good fortune. But what am I to do when they remain cut off from the things that are happening in India and get angrier and angrier that success doesn't come their way? I advise them in all humility and in all modesty to try to find out what is wrong with themselves. We don't say we are infallible. We have made mistakes. You and I and all of us can progress only by trial and error. But we must have at least the capacity to learn from our mistakes, to correct them. Unfortunately our friends in the Socialist Party do not have the capacity to learn from anything, either other people's mistakes or their own mistakes. They do not seem to know what the facts of life are in India. It is no good repeating slogans, however good the slogans might be. Repetition of a slogan does not create a policy.

Let us come to the Communists—these brave revolutionaries whose revolution consists not in an application of intelligence but in trying to find out what is happening 5,000 miles away, and trying to copy it, whether it fits in or not with the present state of India. Their mind is a kind of

inverted mirror which reflects something that happened not today but some time ago in some other country. I am not against communism. I am not against socialism. The only thing is, I am for India and nobody else. I am for the Indian people. The other day the leaders of the Soviet Union came here and we gave them a welcome which they will remember and the world will remember. It was a friendly welcome, a cordial welcome, because we are not opposed to them. We are friendly with them and their country. We wish them well. But wishing them well doesn't mean that we should lock up our own minds and intelligence and forget our own experience and our own country. India is some definite entity in the world. And I cannot understand how anyone can simply imagine that India's mind and heart can be locked up and made to follow a dictated policy from somewhere else. Is that the kind of independence and freedom that we have achieved? Surely not. It is a different matter to be friendly, to learn from other countries. And I tell you there is a great deal that we can learn from Russia. Plenty of people from the Soviet Union are coming to India—technicians, doctors, and people who help in industries, from whom we intend learning. We are even sending for their coaches for athletics. Similarly we want to learn from China, where there has been very great development recently of co-operatives. Well, we want to develop our co-operatives and we shall send our people to learn how the Chinese are doing it and how far we can learn from them. We propose to learn a great deal from the United States of America, which is the most advanced industrial power in the world. So we propose to learn from every country and we propose to be friendly with every country.

But our friends, the Communists, have the idea that friendship with one country inevitably means hostility towards another country. That is, to be friends you must not only be friends with me, but you must be enemies to my enemy, or those whom I consider my enemy. This, surely, is a remarkable attitude to take.

The Communists tell us that the basis of society is class struggle and therefore the people must be trained for class struggle and for destroying the upper classes. I also want a

classless society in India and the world. I do not want any privileged classes. I do not want a great deal of inequality among people. The point is how we are to proceed about it. Even recognizing the conflict between classes, the right way of liquidating that conflict is to put an end to it by peaceful methods. There is conflict all over the world whether between nations or between classes. There was a great deal of conflict between the rulers and the people in the Indian States, but we settled that in a different way. It does not do any good for anybody today to tell me what happened in the French Revolution 160 years ago. A hundred and sixty years have made a difference to the world. It is no good telling me what happened in Russia 38 years ago, in the Great Revolution, because the conditions in Russia were peculiar to Russia. They do not exist in India. Our conditions are different. We can learn from the French Revolution, from the American Revolution, from the Russian Revolution, from the Chinese Revolution as well as other revolutions. But we have to find our own way out. Unfortunately our friends of the Communist Party in India have so shut their minds and have so spent all their time and energy in learning a few slogans of the past that they are quite unable to appreciate what is happening in India. In fact, these great revolutionaries of the Communist Party of India have become great reactionaries.

GOVERNMENT AND THE PEOPLE

THIS SEMINAR to discuss parliamentary democratic forms of government is a very good move. I have looked at the heads of discussion on which papers have been received. They are interesting aspects of parliamentary democracy, but it seems to me that they deal with somewhat superficial aspects of the question. Democracy, as a speaker just now said, is a means to an end. What is the end we aim at? I do

Address to the First All-India Seminar on Parliamentary Democracy,
New Delhi, February 25, 1956

not know if everybody will agree with me, but I would say the end is the good life for the individual. What form it should take can be argued about, but the good life certainly must imply a certain satisfaction of the essential economic needs, which will release him from continuous oppression, and which will give him a chance to develop his creative faculties.

Parliamentary democracy is a growth of the last 150 or 200 years. We must remember that even in England the franchise was strictly limited till recently. Twenty or thirty years ago a small percentage of the population had the vote. Even now in quite advanced countries, women, who form half the population, do not have the vote. Democracy in those countries is presumably 'male democracy'.

It needed many struggles before democracy in the nineteenth century could widen out from the strict confines of certain classes. As the franchise was extended, the representatives chosen also ceased to belong to the higher classes. It is only in the last thirty years or so that adult franchise has come into being in a number of countries. This period is not long enough really to tell us what the ultimate effects of the universal franchise are likely to be in solving problems. Problems are solved not merely by the governmental structure being good but by the quality of human beings, their education and their character. The machine can, at best, make it easier for those qualities to develop and remove any elements which suppress growth.

In the past, democracy has been taken chiefly to mean political democracy, roughly represented by the idea of every person having a vote. It is obvious that a vote by itself does not mean very much to a person who is down and out and starving. Such a person will be much more interested in food to eat than in a vote. Therefore, political democracy by itself is not enough except that it may be used to obtain a gradually increasing measure of economic democracy. The good things of life must become available to more and more people and gross inequalities must be removed. That process has, no doubt, gone on for some time in countries where there is political democracy.

One of the basic revolutions of the world has been the

Industrial Revolution which has changed the texture of human life. But people's minds lag behind events. Sometimes the person who considers himself most revolutionary is very conservative, that is, he holds on to things regardless of the changing conditions. The French Revolution came with a mighty bang, frightened Europe and created innumerable waves of thought which affected Europe for almost the next hundred years. Again and again in the rest of Europe there were waves—in 1848, for example—of revolutions following the ideas of the French Revolution, but they ended up as petty revolutions. Even the French Revolution, when it occurred, was rather out of date in the sense that something bigger was happening behind it—the Industrial Revolution. The leaders of the French Revolution were hardly conscious of the Industrial Revolution that was in its early stages. They were thinking mainly of political problems. For a considerable time after the French Revolution, while the Industrial Revolution was working its mighty change, the thinking of people was governed by the slogans and ideas of the French Revolution.

Something big has happened in the structure of human life with the coming of atomic energy. We may take this as the consummation of the industrial age. It forces us to decide how we are going to use this mighty power: rightly or wrongly, in conflict or in co-operation. All this should really force us to think on entirely new lines. We have to decide how to face these problems and not continue to think of petty matters.

We believe in democracy. Speaking for myself, I believe in it, first of all, because I think it is the right means to achieve ends and because it is a peaceful method. Secondly, because it removes the pressures which other forms of Government may impose on the individual. It transforms the discipline which is imposed by authority largely to self-discipline. Self-discipline means that even people who do not agree—the minority—accept solutions because it is better to accept them than to have conflict. It is better to accept them and then change them, if necessary, by peaceful methods. Therefore, democracy means to me an attempt at the solution of problems by peaceful methods. If it is not peaceful, then to

my mind, it is not democracy. If I may further elaborate the second reason, democracy gives the individual an opportunity to develop. Such opportunity does not mean anarchy, where every individual does what he likes. A social organization must have some disciplines to hold it together. Those can either be imposed from outside or be in the nature of self-discipline. Imposition from outside may take the form of one country governing another or of an autocratic or authoritarian form of government. In a proper democracy, discipline is self-imposed. There is no democracy if there is no discipline.

The question arises: if people cannot observe discipline, then does not the democratic structure tend to crack up? Something will have to take the place of democracy to enforce discipline. The enforced discipline may come—as it sometimes has—from military dictatorship. If a vacuum is created, external authorities may fill it or some internal authority grows up to fill it.

A theoretical enunciation of the Constitution does not solve any problem. The Constitution may be excellent, but it is the measure in which the Constitution reflects not only the thinking but the character of the people that will make for its successful working. We have seen some very excellent Constitutions going to pieces after a few years because of people not acting up to their own Constitution or because the Constitution does not fit in with their thinking or solve their problems.

Many books have been written about parliamentary government. My knowledge is largely confined to English books, a few American books and a very few French books. When I read them, I get the feeling that they refer to developments in the nineteenth century and do not relate to today's problems.

The problems of government have grown so enormously that sometimes one begins to doubt whether the normal parliamentary procedures are adequate to deal with them. I remember reading discussions about this growing difficulty in the British Parliament thirty years ago. They were not finding time to deal with these problems in detail and suggestions had been made from time to time for powers to be

transferred to large committees of Parliament which could deal with legislation in detail and finalize it once the principle had been laid down by Parliament. That is one way of getting over the difficulty, but I do not know whether any satisfactory solution has been found. Parliaments nowadays have to work much harder than they used to. Members of Parliament get a vast number of papers to study which they can hardly read. They have to sit late hours to grapple with the problems. If the average Member has to carry this great burden of printed paper and sit late hours, with select committees and all kinds of other committees functioning, you can very well imagine what the poor members of the Government have to carry. In addition to the papers given to private Members, they have to carry the burden of decisions and many other loads which are part of the day-to-day government of the country not coming up before Parliament. The business of Government and the business of Parliament become more and more complicated and it becomes a little doubtful how far parliamentary democracy can carry on its work and solve such problems. Some kind of a division of authority may become necessary; otherwise problems might remain unsolved, and unsolved problems are dangerous. The nature of government has progressively changed in every country, whether the structure of society there is capitalist or socialist or something in between. Even in countries supposed to be intensely capitalistic the governments perform social functions to a great extent today. Functions normally relegated to private individuals or private enterprise are now performed by governments. The pressure of circumstances is such that the social sector of governments has grown even in countries which normally do not want it to grow. In the other countries which deliberately aim at dealing with this sector governmentally, it will of course grow more. Thus, whatever the basic policy pursued by a country, it becomes inevitable for the governmental structure to become involved in social problems ever increasingly. The old idea of government used to be a police State. I am not using that word in a bad sense but in the sense that the government's chief functions were those of guarding the country, giving security to the country

from external invasion and internal disorder, collecting taxes, and so on. These were the main functions of government. Governments must continue to discharge them, but innumerable other functions have come in. How far can parliamentary democracy be adapted to meet these new burdens and functions of government satisfactorily, effectively and in time? Time is the overriding consideration and that is why the question has arisen whether it is possible to have devolution of authority in parliamentary democracy which ensures that these problems can be dealt with rapidly and effectively. The easiest way to deal with a problem is for an autocrat or dictator to settle it at once, rightly or wrongly. Obviously, that is an approach which is bad for the growth of the people. It does not develop that creative energy, that spirit and that sense of freedom which we consider essential. But remember also that creative energy and a sense of freedom do not develop merely by giving a person the right to vote.

Parliamentary democracy is inevitably going in the direction, everywhere, of what might be called economic democracy. It may take different forms, but only in the measure that it solves the economic problems does it succeed even in the political field. If the economic problems are not solved then the political structure tends to weaken and crack up.

Ultimately, all problems concerning human beings and their mutual relations depend on the character of the human beings. The same type of governmental machinery or constitution might be totally unsuited to different conditions, to different backgrounds of people, although certain basic principles may be common. We in India, owing to a very long period of contact with England and with British parliamentary institutions, were made to think on the lines of wanting British parliamentary institutions in India. When the chance came, we reproduced those parliamentary structures and institutions here in a large measure. I think we have largely succeeded and I think we shall succeed even more. The question that I have put before you is not merely related to India but to every country: how far this parliamentary structure, as it is, is competent to deal with the great

problems that come one after another at the beginning of this atomic age.

We talk about the spread of political power, in the sense that everybody has a vote. We have to remember at the same time that there are methods of influencing people in the right or in the wrong direction—methods of propaganda which may excite people, let us say, and bring them up to a high temper and create war conditions. These engines of propaganda may be exploited by democracy or they may break up democracy. We live in such an extraordinary age of change that every old yardstick is too short to measure it.

There is one aspect of democratic government to which we in India must give more consideration than other countries. In Western Europe they developed their parliamentary system gradually, in the course of a hundred years or more. Occasionally there were conflicts; occasionally there was a danger of a crack-up, but somehow they managed to get over it all. Except for these occasional conflicts, it has been a long period of relatively measured advance, and progress has been without too great a stress.

In India, we have certain advantages and certain disadvantages. In the course of the last thirty or forty years, we built up a movement of an unusual type. While it was largely a peaceful movement, it was nevertheless a revolutionary movement. This unusual combination of revolutionary content and peaceful methods changed the character of the people in the course of a generation. Freedom was not suddenly thrown into our laps. We struggled for it; we conditioned ourselves for it; we went through great strain and trouble over it. But the change was far less difficult than in any other country that I can think of because we were conditioned to function peacefully. The trail of bitterness and conflict did not pursue us and we could adapt ourselves mentally and physically to the changed conditions. At the same time, since our whole training has been in opposition, it has not been easy to get our people out of the habit of thinking and functioning as though they are in the opposition. It is a natural feeling, and has developed in all countries, particularly in countries which have had major revolutions.

Sometimes, the very people who made the revolution have been put an end to. There have been counter-revolutions.

When a country is shaken up in a big way there are all kinds of consequences. One cannot, in an academic manner, lay down what should happen first and what should happen next. When millions of people are on the move, they go their own way. The bigger the country the more difficult the problem of leading them. If our methods had not been peaceful, and if in the course of our struggle we had not developed a great measure of self-discipline, our problem might have been very difficult to solve, if not insoluble. If we had developed self-discipline even more, the country would have been much stronger. What saved us was the measure of self-discipline we did have. It is that which put us in a position to utilize for the right purposes the strength we had gathered in the course of our struggle. Otherwise, as has often happened in revolutionary struggles, that very strength might have turned against us and might have done us a great deal of injury, in the form of internal strife and so on. A revolution, whether it is violent or peaceful, produces difficult problems of adaptation. In a violent revolution, the crack-up and the break are naturally much greater. You can see many countries in Asia—I do not wish to mention their names—which have also come out of revolutionary crises and struggles, and which still have to face and solve their problems. You can see other countries where changes have been made which have not grown out of the conditions and circumstances of the country.

To sum up, all our institutions, including the parliamentary institutions, are ultimately the projections of a people's character, thinking and aims. They are strong and lasting in the measure that they are in accordance with the people's character and thinking. Otherwise, they tend to break up.

THE APPLEBY REPORT

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Sir, as I indicated at the beginning of this discussion, it is not my intention at this stage to go into the recommendations, suggestions and criticisms made in the Appleby Report, chiefly because we want to consider them very carefully in Government and then come up to Parliament for guidance.

I find that the Report has been looked at as if it was an attack on some privilege of ours and we were on the defensive. The House will notice that Government, in various departments, are criticized in very strong language. We do not object to it. We want criticism to be as strong as possible. Therefore we have welcomed Dr. Appleby's criticism both this time and on the last two occasions he was here.

Dr. Appleby is a person of considerable experience in administrative procedures not only in the United States but in nearly all the countries of Europe. He has been for long considered one of the major experts in administrative matters. That does not mean that what he says about India must inevitably be right or good. But he is a person who is entitled to express an opinion, and his opinion has to be considered carefully.

It so happened that he came here about three or four years ago on the first occasion, and the report he issued then was later placed before the House and sent to the State Governments. We profited greatly by that report, and some improvements were made as a result in our internal procedures in the Finance Ministry and in other Ministries. I think that the Organization and Methods Division was started because of those discussions on the Appleby report, and the Division is doing really good work. He came for a second time about two years ago, and he made certain comments. On this occasion he came again, for the third time, although he is a busy man—he has been for some time what might be called the Finance Minister of New York State. They do not call him by that name, but his function is to deal with the considerable

finances of New York State. All that may not qualify him to be a final judge in regard to our matters, but it does show a degree of competence and experience. We have welcomed his visit here and profited greatly by it.

The whole aim of his analysis is to find out how we can meet the needs of today in India. We are a new State which is not only dealing with social matters, but trying to deal with them at a rapid pace. Ours is a State which is industrializing itself and trying to grow. Dr. Appleby has pointed out that we cannot do this satisfactorily in the framework of the administration which we inherited from the British, although he has paid tribute to the personnel. The House will remember that he has said that the quality of administration in India is as high as in almost any other country of the world. From the point of view of efficiency and purity of administration, in spite of the fact that there was corruption here and there, he said that India came in the top dozen or so of the countries of the world. Having said that he has remarked that the system that we have, though good enough for the previous type of State, was not fast-moving; it was slow and there were too many checks and counter-checks with the result that delays occurred. That was his first criticism.

When he came a second time he expressed surprise and satisfaction that things had moved much faster than he had thought they could move under the system. This had become possible partly because of certain minor changes that had been made, and partly, according to him, because the people constituting the administrative apparatus had worked very hard. On this occasion again, he began by saying that one could not expect them always to be overworking themselves. The whole criticism of Dr. Appleby is that this machine should move faster. In saying so it is obvious that Dr. Appleby is partial to his American background.

We are not interested in retaining a particular administrative framework or throwing it away, but we are interested in getting the job done as quickly and rapidly and as well as possible. We are interested in accomplishing our Five-Year Plan goals both efficiently and speedily, with purity in our administration.

Therefore, we welcome all suggestions, from any quarter, and examine them with our own experience and try to improve our system. We do not say that our administrative apparatus is perfect. At the same time, it is admitted that our administrative apparatus, framed originally for different purposes, has adapted itself to the change in India much better than might have been expected.

This House sometimes criticizes, perhaps rightly, the growth of all Government offices and the increase in the numbers of Ministers, Deputy Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries and of people employed by Government. But the fact is that the work we have to deal with has grown in geometric and not arithmetic proportion. It is fifty times or a hundred times what it was before. This puts a tremendous burden on everybody. Work grows; trained people are lacking. Obviously, the type of work we have to do requires more and more trained technicians, trained scientists, trained engineers, trained administrative officers and so on.

One of our big problems today is this question of manpower. How to train our man-power adequately and utilize it immediately? Not in the present haphazard way in which people go through colleges and universities and then knock about having no work to do because they do not fit in with the kind of work required. There is no doubt that we shall be training men in much larger numbers than now. We have in fact to compete with other nations.

I am told that in the Soviet Union they are producing 75,000 engineers a year. We may not produce 75,000, but we should be able to produce 5,000 or 10,000. I was just reading today that there were 2,50,000 science teachers there—just science teachers!

Two countries which are very much opposed to each other, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, have some things in common. Among them is a certain vitality, a certain adaptability, and a certain knowledge of the changing world. They are trying to adapt themselves, scientifically, industrially and technologically. All other countries lag behind them. You will find that the average man from America and the average man from the Soviet Union

offer the same criticism of India. It is interesting to remember that the American who comes here dislikes all our checks and balances. He wants to go ahead. Every Government must have checks and balances. But he says we have too many. The man from the Soviet Union—we do not have the average man from the Soviet Union, we usually have the specialist—offers exactly the same criticism to us. He says: "We cannot get work done what with your checks and balances and references and this and that. Why don't you give more authority to a general manager to go ahead, as we have done in the Soviet Union?" Mere theoretical considerations do not help. Theoretically Parliament is supreme, and Parliament must remain supreme. We must have the democratic structure. We must follow the fundamental basis of our Constitution. Nobody challenges that. We must have our checks; we must have the Auditor-General. But we have also to deal with problems in a practical way.

My friend, the Minister in charge of steel plants, is constantly being pushed by the Russians who are building a steel plant at Bhilai. They want things to be done quickly. They want him to delegate responsibility, and they say they cannot wait for others. It is odd that the same type of criticism comes from the Soviet Union and from the United States, although they have entirely different structures.

Shri H. N. Mukherjee is constantly talking about bureaucrats, and about bureaucratic machinery crushing the spirit of the people. I do not know what he would call the men governing the Soviet Union at the present moment. I say it is the essence of bureaucracy. And I say the more socialist we get in this country, the more will bureaucracy grow. That is the inevitable result of socialism. Perhaps it should be a better type of bureaucracy, but it will be bureaucracy nevertheless. In the complicated modern State, whether it is India or America or the Soviet Union, bureaucracy is unavoidable.

In America they have what is called "the spoils system", though it is a little less evident now than before. When a new administration comes in, they push out almost everyone down to the local postmaster in a village. Everybody changes and in

come the new party men. In the Soviet system too, sometimes, lots of people change suddenly.

But the point is that we cannot escape bureaucracy, though we must improve it. In the old days we thought of bureaucracy mostly in terms of the Indian Civil Service, but that idea has changed. Only a few people of the Indian Civil Service are left. The Indian Administrative Service is bred and conditioned in a somewhat new atmosphere. But apart from that, a new invasion is taking place in the so-called bureaucracy and that is the invasion of the technical man, the engineer. He is coming in large numbers into our whole apparatus and he will come in ever-growing numbers. We have to rely on them; we have to train them more and more. The Government will be progressively more bureaucratic in that sense.

As our work becomes more complicated and various, it becomes increasingly difficult for Parliament to keep pace with it. If Parliament cannot keep pace with it and yet has to control it, it has to pick and choose the strategic points; it has to see what are the important points which it must hold and check and not waste time on the comparatively trivial matters. Otherwise, important matters slip away and attention is drawn to the trivialities.

If the hon. Members recollect the history of the growth of the parliamentary system in England, they will see that the Parliament of the nineteenth century in the United Kingdom was something completely different from what it is today. Apart from the fact that it was not a very democratic Parliament—I mean to say that franchise was very limited—that Parliament had leisure. The private member had full scope. It was a private members' Parliament. Government hardly initiated major decisions. Sometimes it did, of course, but these occasions were few and far between. And the private member had full charge.

Gradually, the work of Parliament and of Government in Parliament has grown so greatly that the poor private member in the British Parliament, as in other Parliaments, has got pushed out, by sheer force of circumstances. The most vital and important things are decided by Parliament by a

basic decision on the principle and then referred to some other body. Take an instance. There were two main parties in the British Parliament of the nineteenth century. These two parties were for and against free trade. The old Liberal and the Conservative Parties were divided on vital matters. Yet, later, when protection came in, somewhat upsetting the hundred-year-old policy of the British, it is astonishing how the principle was accepted and the Board of Trade was told to draw up lists, duties, etc. Parliament hardly found time to consider it. It just decided to have protection. That having been decided, the Board of Trade officials did the rest.

By the compulsion of events, therefore, Parliament cannot deal with these numerous matters. When we have in India not two State corporations but a hundred, it is competent for Parliament, but it will never have the time, to look into each of them. It has the power to do anything at any time, and if it chooses, it will do it. But we have to evolve other methods, and full initiative has to be given for unhindered progress. These are problems which are created by the facts of today, and we have to consider them carefully and change our administrative or financial system step by step as we gain experience and as we see what changes are necessary.

Shri Gadgil wants Government's proposals based on the Appleby Report. I hope to put forward Government's ideas on the subject in the next session. But they cannot all form one consolidated proposal, because things are continuously changing. For instance, during the last year or two, we have been progressively delegating authority, having accepted that broad principle. We are perhaps going a little slower than we ought to. The Finance Ministry, which has been complained against greatly, not only by Dr. Appleby but very often by the other Ministries of the Government of India also, is delegating its authority and introducing what is called internal financial advisers. That is, instead of every matter being referred to the Finance Ministry, one of its advisers sits with the Ministry in question and deals with things. This avoids delay. Only very important matters need go to the Finance Ministry.

We feel we should similarly delegate authority to our autonomous corporations, keeping checks and controls as far as possible. So our reply to any question is not to give a mere 'yes' or 'no', but to make such gradual changes as appear desirable and as do not involve any grave financial risks. I shall, from time to time, place before the House the steps that we are taking. In the course of the next session, I hope that we shall be able to arrange an informal discussion among as many Members of Parliament as wish to join. We shall discuss the various points that the Appleby Report raises in regard to the administrative system.

If I may again mention it, one should not feel irritated because of the strong language that Dr. Appleby has used. He would have used different language if he knew we were going to place the Report before Parliament. But we wanted our senior officials to be shaken up. In fact, Dr. Appleby even offered to change his language if the Report was going to be published, but I told him to leave it as it was, for it was good. Let us think rather of the great problem that we have to face. It is a problem which the United Kingdom has also to face today. After all, our civil services were modelled somewhat after the United Kingdom pattern. They have had the same difficulties as we. It may be that they have greater experience and their country is small, but they have this problem. Similarly I know it as a fact that the Soviet Union is constantly struggling with the problem of how much authority to delegate and how much not to delegate. They impressed upon me when I was in the Soviet Union—they also impressed it upon us when they came here—that we were making a great mistake in not delegating authority, and that they were delegating much more authority now simply because they found that the rapidly-moving machine of theirs was checked and stopped repeatedly because authority had not been delegated. Of course, they have close supervision, as every government has. And I would remind this House, when it talks about government by Joint Secretaries, Deputy Secretaries and Under Secretaries, that that is exactly the type of government that both the United States and the Soviet Union have today.

THE OPPOSITION

I READ YESTERDAY that my friend and old colleague, Jayaprakash Narayan, has said recently* that I should help—I forget his words—in establishing or in developing a strong opposition to the Congress. This is a very strange request. I believe completely in any government, whatever it might be, having stout critics, having an opposition to face. Without criticism people and governments become complacent. The whole parliamentary system of government is based on such criticism. The free Press is also based on criticism. It would be a bad thing for us if the Press was not free to criticize, if people were not allowed to speak and criticize government fully and in the open. It would not be parliamentary government. It would not be proper democracy. I welcome criticism in Parliament. In fact, we welcome criticism from our own party members. The amount of room we have in our own party for criticism of Government's policy is great. But when Jayaprakashji says that I should build up an opposition, does he want me to build up a bogus thing to oppose the Congress? What value or what virtue will that have? He gives the example, I think, of the great Turkish leader, Kemal Ataturk. With all respect to Jayaprakashji, the example is not a good one. There was no democracy in Turkey, real or even unreal. It was a dictatorship. Does he want that kind of thing to happen in India? The point is that the opposition should have the freest opportunity to express its opinion in the Press and on the platform and to fight elections. I cannot canvass for the P.S.P. or the Communist Party. They have the freest opportunity to do so. The Election Commission is independent of Government. It is open to you, to any of you, to vote as you like. You know that there is no question of pressure or coercion. I do submit that we in India have a greater degree of freedom in elections—and in things

From a speech at Island Ground, Madras, January 31, 1957

*Speaking at Begusarai, Bihar, on January 28, 1957, Shri Jayaprakash Narayan, the Praja Socialist leader, had said that Prime Minister Nehru should help the growth of a strong opposition party in the country.

other than elections—than almost any other country in the world. There may be a few countries which have the same freedom as we have. But a far greater number of countries in the world have no such freedom. We have it and I am proud of it and I am sure it will continue. I want every type of oppositionist to go and apply to the people. If the people are not going to vote for him, am I to coerce them to vote for him?

Jayaprakashji says it would be good for the Congress to be defeated. I might perhaps agree that it might be good for the Congress to be defeated, but surely the question is not for us, but for the people. The issue is what is good for the country, not what is good for the Congress. Our friends like Jayaprakashji have got so entangled in their dislike of the Congress that they have forgotten such a thing as India and the good of India. It is my belief that if by any mischance the Congress was defeated it would be very bad for India. I do not say that Congressmen are better people than others. There are good men in other organizations. There are patriots in other organizations. It is not a question of personal friendship; it is a question of the national good. Suppose in Parliament, instead of the strong Congress Party, we had a dozen or twenty small groups with nobody in a majority. What would happen? There would be no stable government, and each little group would intrigue with the other. There would be offers of ministerships for people who gave up a party to join another. That is what inevitably happens when there are all kinds of parties with none having a majority. I can give you instances where countries are failing because of the failure to get a stable government. At a time when we talk of the Second Five-Year Plan, when the energy of the nation should be put into development, when we have Pakistan shouting itself hoarse about *jihad* and war, are we to experiment with numerous odd groups? It surprises me and amazes me that a person of good sense should suggest something which totally ignores the facts of life in India today. The facts of life are these, that we have to fight a tremendous opposition in India, not any political party, but our own failings, our own liability to go wrong, our disruptive tendencies,

our communalism, our provincialism, our casteism, our readiness even to break into violence, and so many other things. Our history shows that we are very prone to disruptive, fissiparous tendencies. And if British rule in India did a good thing, it was to make us united in our fight. But really the first effective mass-scale attempt to build up this unity was by Gandhiji under and within the Congress. It brought results, and yet you see how soon such unity goes to pieces. Take the question of States' reorganization. Whether the decision was right or wrong, is it not fantastic for people to commit murder, arson and violence on that account? Does it not show our inherent weakness? It may be, of course, that this was done for political reasons, because of the approach of elections. I put it to Jayaprakashji because his own party—the P.S.P.—took a considerable part in this agitation. I am not for a moment criticizing their view of the matter or their taking part in agitations with regard to boundaries. But I do submit that by doing it in the way they have, they encouraged the most dangerous thing in India, that is, the tendency to disruption.

PARLIAMENTARY DEMOCRACY

MR. SPEAKER, SIR, you have been pleased to say many generous things about the Members of this House and, to my great embarrassment, about me. I should like to offer you my grateful thanks, and I am sure I speak on behalf of the House also when I offer you their thanks for your kind words.

It is befitting that on this occasion, when this Parliament stands at the edge of its own dissolution, there should be some valedictory references to our past. Since you have been good enough to make a reference to the work of this Parliament, I am taking the liberty of also saying a few words.

We have gone through, during these five years, a tremendous amount of work, and, as you have said, the speeches have covered I do not know how many millions of pages; questions have also been asked, and altogether, a vast quantity of paper has been consumed.

Yet, the historian of the future will probably not pay too much attention to the number of speeches or the hours which the speeches have taken or to the number of questions, but rather to the deeper things that go towards the making of a nation.

Here we have sat in this Parliament, the sovereign authority of India, responsible for the country's governance. Surely, there can be no higher responsibility or greater privilege than to be a member of this sovereign body, which is responsible for the fate of the vast number of human beings who live in this country. All of us, if not always, at any rate from time to time, must have felt this high sense of responsibility and destiny to which we had been called. Whether we were worthy of it or not is another matter. During these five years we have not only functioned on the edge of history but sometimes plunged into the processes of making history.

We have lived here, as indeed people have lived all over the world, at a moment of great change and transition, of fast upsets and revolutionary processes. Not only have we been part of that world drama but we have had our own drama also. It would be interesting for someone to take a rather distant view of the drama of these five years and more, not being lost in the innumerable confusing details, but seeing this broad current of history in motion in this country: how far has it moved, what changes has it wrought, how far has it laid stable foundations for this Republic of India which the people of India created a few years back? That is the important consideration; not how many speeches we have delivered or how many questions we have asked.

We chose this system of parliamentary democracy deliberately; we chose it not only because, to some extent, we had always thought on those lines previously, but because we thought it was in keeping with our own old traditions, not the old traditions as they were, but adjusted to the new

conditions and new surroundings. We chose it also—let us give credit where credit is due—because we approved of its functioning in other countries, more especially the United Kingdom.

So, this Parliament and the Lok Sabha became to some extent like the British Parliament and the British House of Commons, in regard to our rules of procedure and methods of work.

Parliamentary democracy demands many virtues. It demands, of course, ability. It demands a certain devotion to work. But it demands also a large measure of co-operation, of self-discipline, of restraint. It is obvious that a House like this cannot perform any functions without a spirit of co-operation, without a large measure of restraint and self-discipline in each group. Parliamentary democracy is not something which can be created in a country by some magic wand. We know very well that there are not many countries in the world where it functions successfully. I think it may be said without any partiality that it has functioned with a very large measure of success in this country. Why? No so much because we, the Members of this House, are exemplars of wisdom, but, I think, because of the background in our country, and because our people have the spirit of democracy in them.

We have to remember what parliamentary democracy means, more so in this time of change and ferment than in ordinary times. Even when the old order is good, it has to yield place to a new one, lest one good custom should corrupt the world. Change there must be, change there has to be, particularly in a country like India which was more or less changeless for a long time, changeless not only because the dynamic aspect of the country was limited, restricted and confined by foreign domination, but also because we had fallen into ruts of our own making, in our minds, in our social framework and the rest. So we had to take our souls out both from the ruts and from the disabilities and restrictions caused by alien rule. We had to make rapid changes in order to catch up.

But, while change is necessary, there is another quality that is also necessary—a measure of continuity. There has always

to be a balancing of change and continuity. Not one day is like another. We grow older each day. Yet, there is continuity in us, unbroken continuity in the life of a nation. It is in the measure that these processes of change and continuity are balanced that a country grows on solid foundations. If there is no change and only continuity, there is stagnation and decay. If there is change only and no continuity, that means uprooting, and no country and no people can survive for long if they are uprooted from the soil which has given them birth and nurtured them.

The system of parliamentary democracy embodies these principles of change and continuity. And it is up to those who function in this system, Members of the House and the numerous others who are part of this system, to increase the pace of change, to make it as fast as they like, subject to the principle of continuity. If continuity is broken we become rootless and the system of parliamentary democracy breaks down. Parliamentary democracy is a delicate plant and it is a measure of our own success that this plant has become sturdier during these last few years. We have faced difficult and grave problems, and solved many of them; but many remain to be solved. If there are no problems, that is a sign of death. Only the dead have no problems; the living have problems and they grow by fighting with problems and overcoming them. It is a sign of the growth of this nation that not only do we solve problems, but we create new problems to solve.

These five years have passed and we are at the end of this chapter of our history; and the very end suddenly merges into a beginning and we begin afresh, because ends and beginnings are only of our own conception. There is continuous life for a nation. We may pass out of this House or pass out of our lives, but the nation goes on. Therefore, here when we stand at this end, which is also a beginning, we indulge in retrospect and we indulge in prospect. We may think of many things that we have undertaken and of the new labours we have to undertake. But, above all, we have to remember how stable, how deep, are the foundations of this democracy that we have sought to serve and to build up in this country. Ultimately it is on the strength and depth of those roots that we shall

prosper, on strength of character and capacity for service, and not by the number of laws we pass, not by our external activities.

Parliamentary democracy naturally involves peaceful methods of action, peaceful acceptance of decisions taken and attempts to change them through peaceful ways again. It is no parliamentary democracy otherwise. It is essential that we, who talk and believe in the quest of peace so much, should remember that the quest of peace and the quest of democracy can only be made through methods of peace and not through any other methods. We have a great, united country, a country which is dear to us, and which we are proud of. But being proud of it does not mean that we should close our eyes to the grave problems we often have to face in the country and the disruptive tendencies that raise their head and challenge the democratic process which this Parliament represents. It is in the measure that we put an end even in our thinking to these disruptive tendencies which divide us, and which tend to break up the unity of India, that we shall have strengthened our country and laid sound foundations for the future.

May I, as Leader of the House, express my respectful thanks to all the Members of this House for the great courtesy and consideration which they have shown me during these past five years?

FUNCTION OF THE CIVIL SERVANT

A PERSON WHO IS NOT dealing in an expert way with a specific subject will naturally go in for generalizations. I am no expert, and so I can say many things about many subjects. Looking at this Institute from a distance, and looking at its publications, it seems to me that it has been making good progress.

We have been told that similar institutes in other countries

Presidential address at the third annual meeting of the general body of the Indian Institute of Public Administration, New Delhi, April 6, 1957

have begun to appreciate the work of this one. There can be no doubt about the importance of the work which you are called upon to do. I am glad that, from a small annual business session, this gathering, taking advantage of the presence of so many distinguished persons who have come here today, will spread out into a conference on a specific subject matter, namely, recruitment and training for the public services. I feel that this is something really solid and worthwhile. I am quite sure that it will bear results. It may be that the results are not very obvious, but it will in any case be an earnest discussion of subjects of high importance.

I often wonder how we should approach these subjects. There are several possible approaches to them—the technician's approach, the professor's approach and the man-in-the-street's approach. I believe that most of you who have gathered here are either of the administrator type, with actual experience, or the professor type. Both types are very important, both having a fund of knowledge at their disposal. It may be said, however, that neither of these two types represents the man-in-the-street's approach. I do not think the man-in-the-street's approach is likely to be well-informed, or even very helpful. However, it is obviously an important approach, because it is the man in the street or the man in the field who counts; because, after all, it is him that the administration is ultimately meant to serve. You must always remember that aspect; if you do not, you will have no solid ground under your feet. It is worthwhile to repeat this, because the administration not only has to be good but has also to be felt to be good by the people affected. That should always be so, but it is all the more necessary in a fully democratic set-up.

I said a 'fully democratic set-up', because a fully democratic set-up is being fast developed not only in this country but in many others too. This spreading out of democracy brings all kinds of changes in the relationship between the administrative apparatus and the people. Let us take a word which used to be, and still is, usually looked down upon: 'bureaucracy' or 'bureaucrat'. During the British period it was considered to be a bad word by us, and something of that

association clings to it even now. It stood for government officials who considered themselves superior to the common people. There was something in that criticism, and I think it is still somewhat true. Obviously, when there is a democratic set-up, there must be a full realization of the implications of democracy and how it affects public administration in its broader context, if democracy is to be directed into the right channels. In fact, public administration, though necessarily requiring more and more training and experience, has become more and more allied to the democratic element, so that there appears to be no hard and fast demarcation line between the trained public servant and the representative of democracy. If there is no such alliance, or no such mixing together, there may be friction, and there will be hardships on both sides.

Now, what is self-government? We have a Parliament which is sovereign, which, normally speaking, is elected every five years. It is obvious that the vast majority of the measures considered and passed by Parliament are in a way being considered by the three hundred and sixty million people in the country. If I may say so, the people's representatives tend to function on the basis of a feeling of the general pulse of the people. The latter have got the power to kick out a Government, or a Member, after a certain period of time, as it is important to keep the Government or Parliament in check. Again, there also exists a general feeling or awareness in the people that things are being done according to their wishes or in consultation with them; in fact, they have begun to feel that they are governing themselves. This is only partly true, but it is true enough in the sense that there is a check on the Government, and also on Parliament, and that it can be kicked out if it went too far in any direction. Therefore, it behaves and tries to keep in line with public opinion. By and large, a Parliament or a Government does what is reasonable without really making a reference to the people. So long as it gives the impression that democracy has been preserved and that people are being consulted, that their wishes are being respected, all is well. But whether they are actually consulted or not is another matter. If they get the impression that things are being imposed upon them, then friction arises.

Apart from doing his work, the administrator, whether he is low down or high up in the scale, must give the impression, even if that impression is not cent per cent correct, that he is working through the public will and carrying it out. Of course, this cannot always be done; the administrator cannot carry out everybody's will; but he must give the broad impression that he is functioning in accordance with the public will, always thinking of public grievances, trying to remedy them, and consulting the people. Whether such an impression is created or not depends upon the manner in which the administration functions. It is quite essential in a democracy to create this impression in the interest of both the public and the administrator. Otherwise, democracy rebels; perhaps not immediately, but after a period of time. This applies generally to all types of administrative activities but it applies more so to work of a social character, which affects the people at large. Therefore, it becomes all the ~~more~~ important that the administrator has his finger on the pulse of the people all the time, and the people feel that he is one of them, that he is reflecting their wishes and will always continue to do so.

An administrator who is doing an honest man's job, and knows that he is doing his utmost, often does not receive the recognition that is due to him. In fact, he meets with criticism and curses and feels irritated and hurt. An able administrator, however, will always do the right thing and also make the people feel that he reflects their wishes. The sensation must come to the people that he is reflecting their wishes to some extent. When a multitude of voices is advising the administrator or criticizing him, obviously he has to make his own choice and function according to his own decision. He cannot listen to or agree with each of the hundreds and thousands of voices which advise him. But by his manner of functioning he should make them realize that he has given due consideration to what they said and that he has been courteous not only to them but to their thinking. That way, by and large, he will be able to satisfy each of them to some extent.

In administration, as in most things in life, it is not only

what one does, but the manner of doing it that counts. It is exceedingly important in dealings with large masses of human beings, as in a democracy. I should like to stress this especially, because it is of the highest importance as much for the administrator as for the politician. The politician realizes this in the normal course, because he would have to go if he did not realize it quickly enough. The administrator, however, can continue much longer without realizing it fully; but there will be ill feeling against him and he will not be able to do his work adequately because most of it now involves the active co-operation of masses of people. The police functions of the State no longer dominate the scene. Each State wants to advance socially and economically. As a matter of fact, all public administration is bureaucracy in a way. The growth of socialism is the growth of bureaucracy. It is very odd that the people who shout most loudly against bureaucracy are the people who want more and more of it. That is what is involved in the growth of socialistic avenues of work. The administrator's work is becoming bigger and bigger. He does not merely have to keep the peace in a particular area or collect taxes. He must keep in close touch with the people and win them over to his side. In fact, he must have something of the approach of a politician, of a good politician, of an effective politician—not when he tries to get votes, but when he wants to win over the people to his side to do something with their help.

Incidentally, the report of the Director mentions a research project on local self-government. I think that it is of the highest importance that this Institute should give consideration to the administrative problems of local self-government, and even more particularly to those of panchayats. There are hundreds of thousands of panchayats in this country. They form the real base of our democracy. If that base is unsound, then we are not cent per cent stable democratically, even with the second base of our Parliament. We are told that panchayats have not succeeded because there are squabbles, there are parties, there is corruption and all that. It is true, I think, that our experience of panchayats has been distressing. But real democracy cannot exist at the top, it can only arise from the base; and in India

this is not something alien but something natural to the soil. The fact remains that the panchayats are the primary base of our democracy and we have to improve them.

We have to evolve ways and methods to combat faction and corruption in public administration. To take an instance, some kind of compensation is often given in the villages to a large number of people, or some relief work is taken in hand in a village, and some petty official is put in charge of giving relief or compensation. There are always and there will always be great delays in giving it. Very often, by the time it reaches the recipient, either most of it disappears or by then the recipient has suffered a great deal. What are we going to do about it? Are we to wait until everybody is thoroughly honest and will not delay things? Of course, we should try to do that, but we cannot wait. Suppose we try another method of disbursing relief. Suppose the whole village is gathered together, and the Government announcement about the scale of the compensation is made in public. The chances of corruption will become less, because the matter will be too public. This is a very simple thing, but it is not done. Why can't we work through simple methods? I have suggested that instead of summoning the people and making them come again and again, the official concerned should go to the village and call all the people, announce the Government's decision about compensation publicly and say: "Come along, take it here and now." And where this is done, there will be no chances of delay.

Unless some such methods are evolved, corruption will become a serious problem. Of course, some amount of it may continue despite the new methods, for its complete elimination requires higher standards of integrity on the part of the people.

The biggest factor that leads to corruption is delay. The moment you give an officer a chance to delay matters, he can extort money in order to do something. Therefore, a method should be evolved which makes delay impossible. If there is no delay, there is no corruption. But we sit in rooms and form rules and regulations involving a great deal of delay.

I wonder if any of you have come across an address delivered by an Englishman, Mr. K. Blount, in October 1956 at Chatham House, London, on "Science as a Factor in International Relations". I think it appeared in *International Affairs*. It is a very interesting address and I should like to draw your attention to it in connection with the forthcoming discussions in your seminar on the question of training. I did not know this before, that in England a person who has gone in for purely technical studies is not allowed to enter the senior administrative services on the ground that he is not cultured enough, and not an all-rounder in his education, which a public administrator ought to be.

I am thrown back to the time when I was at school in England, more than half a century ago. There used to be great argument then in regard to the form in which and the extent to which the subject of science should be introduced in schools, and whether it should be compulsory or an optional subject. I suppose there have been some changes in the last fifty years; but there is always this pulling in opposite directions of what are called "cultural subjects" which, presumably, produce an integrated human being, and "technical and scientific subjects" which, presumably, produce a useful man. It may well be argued that too much stress on technology and other branches—specialist branches of the physical sciences—has led to a certain lop-sided growth of human beings in industrially and technically advanced countries. It has led to too great a power being placed in the hands of human beings without the corresponding moral capacity to use it rightly. But that is only one aspect of the problem. The other aspect, and an exceedingly important one, is that a country can only survive today if it has enough of scientific and technical personnel. There is no particular reason why the scientist should be an uncultured person; it may well be that the scientist is more cultured and more integrated than a person who has read, let us say, only literature.

I have already referred to Mr. Blount's address. He brings out some points in a way which strikes one's mind. Science itself is very old but scientific methods are only about a

hundred and fifty years old. The application of scientific methods, let us say, to industry, makes a vast difference today. We all know of the vast changes that science has brought about in every field. Now we belong to the age of nuclear energy, when a tiny bit of mass is converted into enormous energy which can be used for both good and bad purposes. Mr. Blount points out that if a country wants to progress it must have the capacity to get itself changed. Any country which is tradition-minded in regard to various matters, including administration, is doomed in a rapidly changing world. Scientific methods, by the collection of data and statistics of all kinds, help one to assess the forces in action, to watch and control them and to stop and remedy what is wrong. In fact, the scientific method means planning. Planning is science in action. Planning has to be flexible; it has to be wide awake and alert. That applies not merely to the industrial process but to the administration as well. Administration has to adapt itself to the changing phases of society.

Another point which Mr. Blount has stressed is that everything apparently depends on the number of technologists and engineers one has in a country. Taking the big countries today, it is now generally agreed that human beings could produce the same results given the same chances. And given the same chance, therefore, the bigger the country and the more the population, the greater the results. And that leads us to the conclusion that China and India, being two countries with vast populations, are likely to forge ahead in technical and scientific fields. Their industrial productivity is gradually increasing. This seems to be all the more true of China. India has to struggle with traditionalism in the shape of some aspects of Hinduism, caste, etc., but India is going along the right road. From the point of view of scientific technique, Western Europe appears to be somewhat on the down-grade and the United States at the peak. The Soviet Union has, in both the width and the intensity of science and technology, gone ahead very fast and is likely to move still faster in the future.

The traditional concept of administration as something apart from the normal life of the community is, I think,

completely out of date today. In fact, the administrator who knows nothing of other jobs would not be a good administrator. In the highly complex society of today the integrating aspect of his role has become exceedingly important, and he must, therefore, keep himself fully informed not only of the developments in the community he serves but also of those in the world at large. There are many problems but the general impression that I get of the world is an impression of disintegration, not of integration. It may be, of course, that this disintegrating process is connected with the transitional phase and out of this disintegration some bigger and deeper integration will come. Anyhow, we are all living in a disintegrating world, where standards have disappeared, moral values have been bidden goodbye, and people think more and more in terms of power over Nature. It is obvious that all this technological and scientific progress in the world, unless it is balanced by some kind of moral standards and ethical values, is likely to lead to destruction. That is why we are so concerned over the basic question presented by atomic energy. Use it for evil, and it will destroy the world; use it for good, and it will raise the world to unknown standards of progress and happiness.

STATES' REORGANIZATION

THE S.R.C. REPORT

I HAVE SPENT many hours this morning and in the afternoon flying over the flood-affected areas in Delhi, East Punjab and PEPSU. Although the floods are subsiding now, I found vast areas, more especially in the Jullundur division, almost entirely covered with water. Many villages and small towns were isolated and some were still inaccessible except by air. Parts of roads had been washed away, the railway line in some places was disrupted and there were numerous breaches in the canal embankments.

These floods occurred owing to extraordinarily heavy rains a week ago and the main rivers, namely, the Sutlej, Ravi and Beas, as well as hill torrents, breaking their banks. The Jamuna has invaded both Old and New Delhi.

The loss and damage caused by this sudden calamity are on a very big scale. The Punjab, being unused to floods, has suffered an even deeper shock than other areas which have some experience of floods. The problem of relief and rehabilitation here, as in other flood-affected areas of India, is a colossal one. I have no doubt that it will be tackled adequately by the State Governments with the help of the Central Government.

During these difficult days, the work of our Army and Air Force in relief work has been of great value, and I should like especially to commend it. Joint operations have been organized to co-ordinate all relief work.

During this year, we have had very unusual floods in Assam, part of West Bengal, Bihar, eastern U.P., Orissa, PEPSU, Delhi and the Punjab. There has been nothing like this in living memory or in the records we have. Probably

such widespread and heavy floods have not taken place for the last sixty to a hundred years. They have been caused chiefly by very heavy rains both in mountains and locally. Why this calamity should have descended upon us in this sudden and disastrous way this year I cannot say. It is clear that normal protective works cannot give adequate protection against such a sudden and wholesale exhibition of nature's fury. Nevertheless, we have to meet this challenge of nature and not only give relief to the best extent possible but also to think of how best to prevent or limit loss in future. So far as relief is concerned, the whole country will no doubt help. We have also received, I am glad to say, generous help from many foreign countries.

In regard to the future, many people think of large-scale embankments and the like. There is no doubt that such protective works are helpful and, where necessary, should be erected. But I think there is too much of the Maginot Line mentality in this matter. No protective work can give much help where widespread cloud-bursts take place bringing a deluge in their train. The best course would be to improve the drainage of the areas concerned so that water can flow away through this drainage system. It is also necessary to build our towns and villages on raised ground so that they might not be affected by the floods. I hope that all these matters will be carefully considered. Meanwhile we must give all the help we can to those who are afflicted not only in the Punjab but in the numerous other areas in north, north-east and east India.

I want to say a few words to you about the Report of the States Reorganization Commission. This was handed to us on September 30. We have been anxious to issue the whole of this Report to the public at the earliest opportunity, and it will be published in the newspapers tomorrow morning. Copies of the Report will be available to the public also.

This Report deals with a vital and most important issue for our present and future and, therefore, it deserves the most careful consideration by all of us. It should be considered not only in its separate parts dealing with special problems but even more so as a whole because of the interrelation of each

of these separate problems and areas. Above all, we have to consider these questions from the point of view of the unity, strength and prosperity of India.

The ultimate decision on the recommendations of this Report will naturally be taken by Parliament. Meanwhile the State legislatures will consider them and give their own opinions, and the public generally will also have every opportunity for the expression of opinion.

Any report coming from a high-level commission which has considered these problems deeply and fully must deserve every consideration. But it is also clear that the Central and State Governments and legislatures should consider these matters with the greatest care, always keeping in view the larger good of the country. It is obvious that in such an intricate and complicated matter, there are bound to be differences of opinion. Having read the Report only during the last few days, I confess that I was a little surprised at some of the recommendations. I should like to confer with my colleagues fully in order to clarify my own mind. I can well imagine that many others who read this Report will feel the same way. The Report should be read as a whole.

No report or recommendations could possibly satisfy everybody. We have thus to find what is good from the point of view of the country as a whole and has the largest measure of agreement and support.

How then are we to proceed about this matter? Obviously the only right course is for us to function with dignity and in a democratic and peaceful way. We cannot decide intricate problems by appeals to passion and in a state of high excitement. Much less can we decide anything by wandering away from accepted processes. I would, therefore, earnestly appeal to everyone in India to approach this question with dignity and forbearance and in a spirit of dispassionate consideration. This is a hard test for us, and our future might well depend upon how we face it and deal with it.

The flood calamities about which I have spoken bring vividly to our minds the dangers that surround us. Even as I speak, the waters of the Jamuna river have entered the streets of this metropolitan city of Delhi. We can only overcome

these dangers, internal and external, if all of us hold together and do not allow disruptive tendencies to come in the way of our united working. I earnestly trust, therefore, that we shall all consider this Report in a manner becoming a great people fashioning their future.

COEXISTENCE AT HOME

MR. SPEAKER, SIR, this is the seventh day, I believe, of this debate and seventy persons have already spoken. I am the seventy-first in the long procession. I have been hesitating whether I should take up the time of this House in this marathon race.

I might straightaway say that I am not greatly interested where a particular State boundary is situated, and I find it very difficult to get passionate or excited about it. I have my preferences, naturally, but it does not make much difference to me where the internal boundary of a State is drawn. Infinitely more important is what happens on either side of the boundary, what happens within the State—more especially in the great multilingual or bilingual areas—and what happens to people inside a particular State who may, linguistically or in any other sense, form a minority. Once we lay down these basic principles correctly and act up to them, then the vast number of problems and difficulties and legitimate grievances that arise will automatically disappear.

I may tell the House that I am not speaking specifically in my capacity as Prime Minister or on behalf of Government and I am not going to make any epoch-making pronouncement. We, in Government, have been considering this Report and other matters that flow from it for the last many weeks and we shall continue to consider them till we come up to this House with our recommendations. Therefore it will not

Speech during debate on the Report of the States Reorganization Commission, Lok Sabha, December 21, 1955

be proper for me or for any other member of Government to speak in any tone of finality about this matter. But I may give expression to my own inclinations in regard to the recommendations of the Report and the other suggestions that have been made.

One thing I should like to say is that I have regretted very greatly certain criticisms that have been made in the Press against the Commission. One can criticize the Commission's recommendations, of course, but to bring a charge of unfairness is itself unfair. It is the kind of approach which will make such work much more difficult hereafter. We choose eminent men; they take a great deal of trouble and tell us what they think about the problem. We may or may not agree with them. But to attack their *bona fides* or fairness is, if I may say so, not only a wrong approach but an indication that one's case is very weak. It is the old story of abusing the attorney on the other side.

May I also suggest, for the consideration of this House, that while Members here represent their constituencies, they represent something more? Each Member is not only a Member for this or that area of India, but a Member for India as a whole. He represents India, and at no time can he afford to forget this basic fact that India is more than the little corner of India that he represents. This is more necessary when we have to face certain forces which may be called separatist. People's attention is being diverted to local, parochial, state and provincial problems and they are forgetting the larger problems of India.

It has been my good fortune and privilege to travel about India a great deal and often to go abroad. I have had that good fortune perhaps more than most Members of this House. As a result I am constantly compelled to think in larger terms, not only in national terms but in international terms. I see the picture of India in that larger context. Perhaps, my travel has helped me to see events in the true perspective. As I travel about India I feel excited by its moving drama. There are of course many things I do not like; but it is inspiring to see India moving today as if by the dictates of some preordained fate and destiny towards its goal. I submit to the

House that we can see this better if we go abroad and see this country from some distance. There are many people in the wide world who also are beginning to feel the drama and adventure of what is happening in India. They see how we have got over great problems and great difficulties. It is true that we have even greater problems ahead, but we are judged in the measure in which we have succeeded in the past. We may argue about the boundary of Bihar or Bengal or Orissa. We may regard the question as important, but the word 'important' is a relative word. There may be things which are more important, and we must not lose ourselves in passionate excitement over the boundary of a State. We must take a total view of India. We must, by Constitution, convention or otherwise, guarantee that a person, whether he lives on this side of the border of a State or the other, will have the fullest rights and opportunities of progress according to his own way. That is my approach to this matter, but I feel that this larger outlook is sometimes lost sight of. Some people have said that the principle of 'linguism' should be extended more and more; some people have criticized my colleague, the Home Minister, because he did not make language the final test. May I say pointedly and precisely that I dislike that principle absolutely, the way it has tended to go?

That does not mean that I dislike language being a very important matter in our administration or education or culture. I recognize that the language of the people is a vital matter for their development, whether it is education, administration or any other matter. But there is a distinction between developing the language to the fullest extent, and this passion for building up a wall around a linguistic area and calling it a border. I completely accept the statement that people cannot really grow except through their language, but it does not follow that in order to make them and their language grow, a barrier must be erected between them and others. The various language areas in India represent the development of history through the ages. But drawing a hard and fast line between two areas is, I think, carrying it too far. As a matter of fact, it just does not matter where you draw your line. If you judge a border purely from the linguistic

point of view, you will be going against the wishes of many people. Invariably there are bilingual areas. As long as you cannot prevent people of one State from going to another, there will always be bilingual areas. Are you going to ~~stop~~, contrary to the dictates of the Constitution, the movement of workers or of other people from one State to another? You cannot. Therefore, whatever fixed line you may draw, people on one side may be attracted to the other and move there, and thus change the linguistic composition of the State or of the border area. Are we going to sit down every few years and say, "The language ratio of this particular *tehsil* or *taluk* has changed, and, therefore, it should be taken out of this State and put into another"? You must realize that while there are clearly marked linguistic regions, there are also bilingual areas and even trilingual areas between two such regions. And wherever you may draw your line, you do justice to one group and injustice to another.

From the language point of view, good reason, good logic and good argument can be found for each side of every case. That is the difficulty. If there was logic only on one side, we could decide easily; but there is logic on both sides and the two logics conflict. There is argument on both sides. You may balance them and say that one argument is stronger than the other. But, generally, if the case of one side appears better the case of the other side seems pretty good too. Maps and census figures have become the fashion now. Are we to weigh in a balance how many individuals speak one language and how many speak another? It will lead to all kinds of fantastic situations. I submit that we must consider this matter separately from the question of language. Of course all the great languages of India, which are mentioned in the Constitution, have to be developed. I would go a step further and say that even those in the North-East Frontier area and elsewhere ought to be developed. Further, the development of one language should not be and cannot be at the expense of the other. I am convinced that the development of any one of the great languages of India helps the development of the other languages. It is my privilege, however unworthy I might be, of being the President of the Sahitya Akademi, started a

year or two ago, where we deal with all the languages of India and try to encourage them. The more we discuss these matters the more we see that encouragement, development and growth of one language result in advantage to the other Indian languages also.

Going one more step I would say that the knowledge of a foreign language helps the growth of an Indian language. If we are cut off from foreign languages, we are cut off from the ideas that are contained in those foreign languages, and from technology which is part of modern life. Therefore, let us not think of excluding a language. Quite frankly, I do not understand the way some people are afraid of the Urdu language. I am proud to speak Urdu and I hope to continue to speak Urdu. I just do not understand why in any State in India people should consider Urdu a foreign language or something which invades their own domain. Urdu is a language mentioned in our Constitution. I object to any narrow-mindedness in regard to Urdu.

It is no use dragging philology into these language controversies. Take the Punjabi language. We have heard learned arguments about the origin of Punjabi and the Gurmukhi script and how far it is connected with Hindi and how far it is independent of Hindi, whether it has descended from Sanskrit and so on—as if the source was of paramount significance. What matters is what people do today. Let scholars go into the past of Gurmukhi and Hindi. If people in the Punjab or elsewhere wish to use or to speak a certain language and to use a certain script, I want to give them every freedom, opportunity and encouragement to do so. Strictly from the practical point of view, the more you try to suppress an opinion the better it survives the suppression. Everybody knows that in regard to language there are intimate and rather passionate ideas in people's minds. But the person who feels passionately about a language must remember that the other man also feels passionately about it. The only course is to give freedom and opportunity to all people. It is not for me or anybody else to go about saying that a language is undeveloped. Even if it were so, it does not matter. Any attempt to decry a language or deny it opportunity is bad

from the point of view of not only that language but other languages.

This question of language has somehow come to be associated with the question of States' reorganization. I repeat that I attach the greatest importance to language but I refuse to associate it necessarily with a State. In our country there are bound to be States where a single language is predominant. But there are also bound to be areas where there are two languages. In such instances, we should encourage both of them. We should make it perfectly clear that the dominant language of that State should not try to push out or suppress in any way the other language of the State. If we are clear about this, then the language issue does not arise.

Connected with language are other cultural issues which should also be treated on the same basis. That is to say, every culture and every manifestation of culture should be encouraged. There is no exclusiveness about culture. The more inclusive you are, the more cultured you are. The more barriers you put up, the more uncultured you are.

Thinking the way I do in this matter, I personally welcome the idea of bilingual or multilingual areas. For my part, I would much rather live and have my children brought up in bilingual and trilingual areas than in a unilingual area. In that manner, I think, I would gain a wider culture and wider understanding of India and of the world.

The House will forgive me if I mention a personal experience. When I had to face the problem of my daughter's education—I was a bad father and I was not with her for years and years—my attempt was this: when she was a little girl, I sent her to a school, not in U.P. but in Poona, as I wanted her, as a child, to pick up some of India's languages. I sent her to a Gujarati school in Poona because I wanted her to know the Marathi language and the Gujarati language and be influenced by them. I sent her subsequently to Santiniketan because I wanted her to understand the Bengali background, not only language but culture. Whether I succeeded or not is another matter. My point is that such was my outlook. I should have liked her to go south and learn Tamil or Telugu or Malayalam. But of course life is not long

enough for us to go to every State. An hon. Member asked me what percentage of the people could learn other languages. I imagine the percentage is very large. I shall tell you what I mean by it. You and I may have some difficulty in picking up another language because we proceed by the grammatical approach. But pick out people from the Delhi bazar and put them in the environment of another language. You will find that in three months they will talk that language as you and I cannot. I can tell you another instance. In our foreign missions, our secretaries and others are supposed to learn the languages of those countries. They try to learn them in a scientific way. Before they know anything of the languages, some of the lower staff who have to work there pick up the languages and talk in them. The way to learn a language is not by worrying about correctness, but by entering into the life of the other people.

I would say that the first and most important question in this entire Report is the last portion in which certain safeguards are mentioned. We should have these clear safeguards laid down possibly in the Constitution or in some other way, so that a fair deal is given to every language in this country. We should not say: "We are in a majority and therefore our language should prevail." Every language has an equal right to prevail, even if it is a minority language in the country, provided it is spoken by a good number of people. I understand that the Bombay Corporation has schools in fourteen languages, because Bombay is a great city with many language groups.

Secondly, if I may venture to lay down a rule, it is the primary responsibility of the majority to satisfy the minority in every matter. The majority, by virtue of its being a majority, has the strength to have its way; it requires no protection. It is a most undesirable custom to give statutory protection to minorities. It is sometimes right that you should do that to give encouragement, for example, to backward classes, but it is not good in the long run. It is the duty and responsibility of the majority community, whether in the matter of language or religion, to pay particular attention to what the minority wants and to win it over. The majority is

strong enough to crush the minority which might not be protected. Therefore, whenever such a question arises, I am always in favour of the minority.

Talking about religion in the broad sense of the word, the votaries of the Hindu religion in our country greatly outnumber the others. Nobody is going to push them from that position; they are strong enough. Therefore, it is their special responsibility to see that people following other religions in India feel satisfied that they have full freedom and opportunity. If this principle is applied, most of these troubles and grievances will disappear.

About a month ago a huge meeting was held in Calcutta which was a kind of public reception to the Soviet leaders who were here. Reference was made to Panchsheel at that meeting. I ventured to say that Panchsheel was no new idea to the Indian mind and that it was inherent in Indian thinking and in Indian culture. Panchsheel ultimately is the message of tolerance. I quoted at that mighty meeting Asoka's edicts and said : "This is the basis of Indian culture and Panchsheel flows from it."

By thinking of Panchsheel and peaceful coexistence in this wide, warring world, we have gained a measure of respect and attention. We have been able to gain this respect because our thinking has been correct and based on principles which are not opportunist, and also because the broad policies we have laid down have not been very divergent from the action we have taken; that is, there has been an approximation between our ideals and action in foreign policy. I do not say they coincide absolutely, but there has been an approximation, and this has been a source of strength to us. It is the conflict between one's ideals and one's action that leads to bad results and to frustration in the individual, group or nation. Where individuals, groups or nations are able to act according to their ideals, they achieve results. In our struggle for independence we were fortunate in being largely able to combine our ideals with our day-to-day activities.

May I, in passing, mention two matters not only because they are relevant, but because we have been criticized in foreign countries with regard to them? The two questions

are Kashmir and Goa. We are accused by our critics of talking loudly about peace and anti-colonialism and following a different policy in Kashmir and Goa. I think that when history comes to be written, Kashmir and Goa will be the brightest examples of our tolerance, of our patience and of the way we have suppressed our anger and resentment at many things in order to follow the broad idealistic policy that we have laid down.

I was saying that I was not concerned greatly with boundaries. I am concerned with two things; first, our principles, and, secondly, the manner of approach to problems, that is to say, how we discuss these matters, how we decide them, and how we accept the decisions made. That is more important than what we decide. When people of varying opinion meet, how do they decide things? The method of democracy is discussion, argument, persuasion and ultimate decision and acceptance of that decision even though it might go against our grain. Otherwise the bigger *lathi* or the bigger bomb prevails and that is not the democratic method. The problem is the same whether atomic bombs are involved or street demonstrations. I do not object to demonstrations, but I object to their violence. There are democratic ways of demonstration too. The atomic bomb symbolizes tremendous violence but it does not poison one's personal thinking so much as smaller violence does. When a man hates his neighbour, and cannot pull on with him, he is degraded as an individual. The hatred of an individual, group or community, the hatred of a Hindu for a Muslim or the hatred of a Muslim for a Hindu or a Sikh is much worse.

The two most important issues in the matter of States' re-organization appear to be Bombay and the Punjab. For myself, I do not care to think what happens to them provided the people of Bombay and the people of the Punjab live in goodwill. It does not matter how you divide or subdivide one State or two States or three or four States. That is a matter which we could consider on administrative, economic, linguistic and other grounds. The basic thing is that after having done that, do you create goodwill and co-operation amongst the people who live there? If you do not, it does not matter how much

you justify the decisions made by census figures and arguments and maps.

Some hon. Members here may well remember that I delivered some speeches in Hyderabad opposing the disintegration of the State of Hyderabad. That was my view. I would still like the State of Hyderabad not to be disintegrated, but circumstances have been too strong for me. I accept them. I cannot force the people of Hyderabad or others to fall in line with my thinking. I accept their decision and I adjust myself to the position that Hyderabad will be disintegrated. The Commission had suggested that if Hyderabad was going to be disintegrated, the Telangana area should remain separate for five years and then decide whether it should merge with the other areas of Andhra. We have no particular objection to that, but logically speaking, it seems to me unwise to allow this matter to be left to argument. Let it be taken up now and let us be done with it.

When I read this Report first I did so rather hurriedly. I may assure this House—because some people seem to doubt it—that I had not seen a single line of the Report before it was officially handed to me, and I knew very little about what it contained before I got it. I read it as something almost new. Because of that, many parts of it and many proposals that it contained were new to me. I had absolutely no notion what they were going to suggest about Bombay, the Punjab or Madhya Pradesh. The thing which for the moment surprised me somewhat was the proposal about Madhya Pradesh for the reason that it was quite novel to me. I had not thought of it in those terms at all. I said so in the broadcast. I did not criticize the Report, but I said that some parts of the Report came as a surprise to me. They did. But we discussed the Report amongst ourselves. The more we discussed, the more we talked, I became more and more convinced that the Commission's proposal was a right proposal. I had no preconceptions and prejudices. So, the House will notice what my mental approach to all these problems has been. I keep an open mind, try to understand the various aspects, and want to arrive at a decision which is an agreeable one and which creates goodwill. Because of this, apart from official

approaches to the problem, we have met literally hundreds and hundreds of persons, in groups of five, ten or twenty, coming from almost every State of India. We have listened to them and we have discussed with them, because we want the greatest measure of agreement and cordiality. We attach more importance to a decision arrived at through goodwill, than to the merely logical decision, for logic is a very feeble and unworthy substitute for goodwill. I would rather have goodwill and co-operation than logic. We have proceeded that way. How far we shall succeed wholly in creating goodwill I do not know. But I am quite positive that, whether the Government does or does not succeed, this House can succeed in giving the right lead to the country. If something is wrong about our decisions, we can consider them quietly later on.

Now take two of the major problems—the question of Bombay and the Punjab.

AN HON. MEMBER : Bihar also.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : With the greatest respect for our friends in Bihar and Bengal and Orissa, I would say that nothing is more unimportant than their problem. I am really astonished at the amount of heat which has been imported about these three or four States. What does it matter if a patch of Bihar goes this way and a patch of Bengal or Orissa goes the other way? I cannot get excited about it, provided always that they get fair treatment.

About Bombay, which undoubtedly is one of our major difficulties, I think there are arguments advanced on the part of Maharashtrians and on the part of others in Bombay. I have no doubt that the arguments advanced by the Maharashtrians have great force. Unfortunately, I see force in the other arguments too. Hon. Members know that the Congress Working Committee, after considerable discussion, suggested three States; but speaking for myself I believe that the recommendation made by the States Reorganization Commission was the best in the circumstances. I do not wish to compel others to accept it. The Maharashtrians, Gujaratis and others are the people who have to reside there, and who am I to push my opinion down their throats, more especially the

Maharashtrians who have played such a vital part in India's history and who have to play such a vital part in the future of India?

Take the Punjab. People talk about unilingual and bilingual States. I have already laid stress on the importance I attach to a language; and, in relation to the Punjab, I would lay stress on the importance I attach to the Punjabi language. I attach importance to it, because, apart from the very important fact of a large number of the Sikhs or all the Sikhs wanting it, I do not understand why the Hindi-knowing people should object. I say that a language should not be considered something exclusive, we must be inclusive in our thinking. Apart from that, the minor modulations of a language represent the growth of a specific culture in a group. The folk-songs of the Punjab are an immensely important part of the Punjabi culture. It does not matter to me for the moment how many books on technology exist in the Punjabi language in the Gurmukhi script. If they do not exist, it is a great drawback from the national point of view. Either that drawback will be made good, or the language will suffer and it will not advance. I wish to give every encouragement to the Punjabi language, though not at the expense of Hindi. There is no question of its being at the expense of Hindi; Hindi is strong enough, wide enough and powerful enough in every way to go ahead. Both languages should co-operate with each other. This whole outlook of one language trying to push out the other is a wrong outlook. So, I have laid stress on this linguistic point. If you look at the Punjab from the linguistic point of view, you will find that there is no proposal conceivable which makes the Punjab completely unilingual, in the sense of the entire area using Punjabi in the Gurmukhi script. So far as the speaking part is concerned, it might well be said that nearly all Punjabis speak Punjabi, whatever they may say. In fact, even Hindi or Urdu is half Punjabi. It is bad to look at it from the communal point of view. It does not matter how much you may divide the Punjab, but the Hindus and Sikhs are intermixed completely. You may, by adjustments, make one 45 per cent and the other 55 per cent, the one 30 per cent and the other 70 per cent and so on. But

you do not change the basic fact that both are completely mixed in each village. Therefore the only way for the Punjab to exist and prosper, rather, even to exist, is for both to pull together. There is no other way. Of course, the Punjabis are people with very great virtues; but, among their great virtues, the virtue of pulling together has not been prominent. Perhaps it may be due to their greater vitality. They are a very vital people. Even today the Punjab is probably the most prosperous of our States from the common people's point of view. Nowhere in India do people drink more milk and *lassi* than in the Punjab. They have a future before them of great advance, with Bhakra-Nangal and other schemes. That is a tremendous future and it surprises me that they should waste their great energies when they have all this work before them. Again I would say, if, as they are, the Hindus in the Punjab are in a majority, it is their duty to win over the Sikhs; and it is the duty of the Sikhs to win over the Hindus. This business of going against each other, trying to trip each other up and weaken each other is not, if I may say so, mature politics. It is immaturity and we have to grow out of it in India.

There are one or two things more I should like to say before I finish. We have to examine all these matters from the point of view of our economic development, the Second Five-Year Plan, and so on. In the drawing up of the Second Five-Year Plan, there has been an attempt to develop almost each individual district, so that, if the district changes over to another area, its development is not greatly affected. But if a whole State is uprooted, practically all our energy and resources will be spent in the next two or three years in settling down and not in working the Five-Year Plan.

The more I have thought about it, the more I have been attracted to something which I used to reject previously and which, I suppose, is not at all practicable now. That is the division of India into four, five or six major groups regardless of language, but always, I will repeat, giving the greatest importance to the languages in those areas. I do not want this to be a step to suppress language, but rather to give it encouragement. That, I fear, is a little difficult. We have gone

too far in the contrary direction. But I would suggest for the consideration of this House a rather feeble imitation of that. That is, whatever final decisions Parliament arrives at in regard to these States, we may still have what I would call zonal councils, that is, a group of three, four or five States, as the case may be, having a common council. To begin with, I would say that it should be an advisory council. Let us see how it develops. Let it be advisory; let the Centre also be associated with it for dealing with economic problems as well as the multitude of border problems or other problems that arise. There can be, let us say, five such zonal areas. There may be in some places a common High Court, a common Governor, and so on, but common economy is more important. We are having these big river valley schemes and other projects. In the main, I want the States to develop the habit of co-operative working. It may be that, later, the advisory zonal councils may develop into something more important. I think we should proceed slowly and cautiously so that people may not suspect us of undermining their States' structure. We could have, let us say, five councils: one for the north, one for the south, one for the east, one for the west and one for the centre. I would submit that for the consideration of this House.

APPEAL FOR GOODWILL

I AM ADDRESSING you on the radio after a long interval. I propose to say a few words to you about the Report of the States Reorganization Commission and the broad decisions that Government have taken in regard to its recommendations.

But before I do that, I should like to draw your attention to the world we live in and the major problems that we have to face. It is in this wider context that we have to view

everything, or else we shall lose ourselves in controversies and quarrels about relatively petty matters.

The dominant fact of the modern world is atomic energy and its dreadful symbols, the atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb. If these terrible weapons are let loose on humanity, then all our hopes are dashed to pieces and humanity perishes. We have protested against war and against the production and experimentation of these weapons. It must be remembered that even without war, if these experiments of explosions of the hydrogen bomb go on, the future of humanity is imperilled, as eminent scientists tell us. And yet we have recently had such an experiment in the Soviet Union and we are told that there is going to be another experiment in the Pacific area. All this is of tremendous practical importance to every human being and it raises moral issues of great significance.

We have talked of peace and followed a policy of peace in our external relations. We have put forward the Panchsheel or the Five Principles and spoken of peaceful coexistence. All this has no meaning if the hydrogen bomb pursues its triumphant and malevolent career.

In a few days' time we shall celebrate Republic Day and complete six years since the formation of our great Republic. During these years we have made marked progress and impressed the world not only with what we have done but with our energy and determination to achieve great things in the future. We have laid down the socialist goal and we are on the eve of the Second Five-Year Plan which will require, as everything that is worthwhile requires, a tremendous effort on the part of our people. More than ever, we require unity, co-operation and hard work.

It is in this context that we have to view the proposals for the reorganization of States. Even before the Report of the Commission was presented to us, many of us felt that the recommendations of such a Report must necessarily be given full weight and accepted, unless there was some overpowering reason against the acceptance of some part. The Report was presented to us on the 30th September. We were anxious to take the public into our confidence and we published this

Report within ten days. After that, in our desire to follow democratic procedures to the utmost, we consulted innumerable representatives from all over India and heard their viewpoints at length. There was force in the arguments advanced, even though they were sometimes opposed to each other. State Governments and State Assemblies were consulted and Parliament had marathon debates. The more we considered this matter in consultation with our colleagues, the more it appeared to us that the only right policy was to accept broadly the recommendations of this Report which had been prepared after great thought and labour by three eminent and impartial men. It was obvious that in regard to almost every recommendation, there was dissatisfaction somewhere and some reason for it. It was impossible to evolve something that was acceptable to all.

We have, therefore, proceeded on this basis of accepting the recommendations of the Report except in a few cases where we found it wholly impracticable to do so.

Among the major questions were those affecting the Bombay State, the Punjab and the proposed Madhya Pradesh State. I am glad that the new Madhya Pradesh has been widely accepted by the people concerned and I have no doubt that this decision is a wise one and will benefit the people of this great State. I am glad also that the new enlarged Mysore State including the Kannada areas will come into existence.

In regard to the Punjab, we have not yet arrived at any final decision.

We have given the greatest thought and care to the question of the Bombay State. We felt that the recommendation of the Commission was a right one, fair to all concerned and likely to lead to progress in this State which has acquired an enviable reputation for its efficiency and progress. But circumstances arose which made the implementation of those decisions impracticable. We explored every avenue with eminent representatives of various viewpoints. In particular, we were anxious to meet the legitimate aspirations of the Maharashtrian people. Bombay City, as is well known, is geographically surrounded by Maharashtra and may be considered a part of it. Even in this City the dominant and

largest linguistic group consists of Maharashtrians. Whatever the fate of Bombay, the Maharashtrians are bound to play a dominant role there.

After innumerable consultations and considering every aspect of the question, we have come to the conclusion that Bombay City should be Centrally administered and two other great States should be formed—one, the Maharashtra State including Vidarbha and the other, Gujarat, including Saurashtra and Kutch.

It is obvious that any decision requires the co-operation of the people affected. It is equally obvious that Bombay City is closely associated with its surrounding areas and there must be co-operation and co-ordination of their activities. Bombay City has played a glorious role in India's history and in our struggle for freedom. It has been the pride not only of those who live in Bombay but of the whole of India.

I earnestly hope that this decision will be considered dispassionately by all concerned and accepted, even though many may not agree with it. We have to finalize this matter and not go on arguing indefinitely.

In regard to the many border issues, we have decided to accept the recommendations of the Commission, except where minor adjustments have been made with the consent of the parties concerned. It may be possible still to make some further adjustments if there is agreement.

The only major issue that remains is that of the Punjab. It is clear that the future of the Punjab depends on the goodwill and co-operation of the Sikhs and the Hindus there. Whatever the decision, this is essential. I trust this will be forthcoming.

Many difficulties have arisen in the past and many complaints have been made which have justification. These difficulties have existed in many parts of India and they will not be solved merely by the adjustment of boundaries. It is necessary, therefore, to have a number of safeguards which will protect linguistic minorities as well as others. We have broadly accepted, therefore, the recommendations in regard to safeguards contained in the Report of the Commission.

We are recommending also the formation of five zonal councils which will give an opportunity for the States

concerned in each zone to confer together about common problems and develop the habit of considering each other's difficulties and finding solutions for them. It is this outlook of mutual understanding and toleration that is the essential thing if we are to progress. The idea of any State standing by itself is, of course, absurd apart from its being opposed to the basic conception of India's unity.

I would earnestly appeal to all our countrymen and comrades to consider these matters in a spirit of peaceful co-operation. India appeals today to the world for peaceful co-existence between nations. How much more is that necessary within the broad confines of our dear country? We shall be false to our message if we do not live up to it ourselves. Above all, we have to approach every problem in a spirit of sweet reasonableness and co-operation. We shall go forward together or not at all. Violence is the very negation of what we stand for and our progress.

This year we celebrate an event of high significance—the two thousand five hundredth anniversary of the Buddha. Let us remember the message of this greatest son of India whose light has illumined not only our country but the world for these thousands of years. That message was inscribed later by the great Asoka on rock and stone which stand today to bear witness to the truth that has guided India through the ages. It is only by the recognition of this great truth that our country and the world will prosper. If the world denies and repudiates it and goes along its violent courses, it will perish.

GROWTH OF VIOLENCE

MAY I REFER briefly to the question of the States' reorganization which has been discussed here during the last four days? I have been greatly distressed about much that has happened. It has caused me much unhappiness and produced in me a sense of failure, which I do not often have. However, what has worried me and distressed me most is not so much the actual occurrences as the recrudescence and growth of a spirit of violence all over the country, or at any rate in parts of it. The attempt to settle problems by violent methods is, I think, very bad for this country, regardless of the merits of any cause. Once you enter the region of trying to settle problems by violent methods, you go towards something that is perilously near to civil war.

Our country, with all its faults, has shown to the world a certain stability, a certain peace, a certain measure of progress, and thereby established a certain reputation. This reputation is based on some fundamental characteristics. If we enter the region of violent explosions simply because we dislike this thing or that, then we lose not only our reputation but something much more important than that.

Are we going to become the type of country where every other month one hears of some kind of a violent revolution? That is not democracy, but something which is the very reverse of democracy. Apart from that, it is a complete denial of any idea of measured or ordered progress. I can understand an attitude—and I believe that some people hold that attitude—that nothing can be achieved by these slow democratic or parliamentary methods, that nothing can be achieved by peaceful methods, that, in fact, nothing can be achieved if one goes about it step by step; that one must break everything and produce some kind of a clean slate to start afresh on. I do not agree with such an attitude. I think it is a matter for the Lok Sabha to consider very carefully where all this is leading us, quite apart from the States Reorganization Report.

In great cities and elsewhere there are always anti-social

elements, *goondas* and the like. One can deal with them if society generally disapproves of them, as it does. But when society or certain respectable sections of society approve of violent methods, then the *goondas* and the disruptive elements can immediately have the chance of their lifetime. What is happening today? Some matter is disliked or disapproved by some group. They say they will demonstrate, have a *hartal* and take out a procession. If shops do not close, they are forcibly closed. If trams or buses are functioning, they are burnt. If an order is passed that there should be no procession, that order is broken. The result is conflict. The police have to step in. Sometimes they have to open fire. Some people are hit; some die and others are wounded. Then there is an outcry against police action and a demand for an enquiry. That is the pattern. The police might have misbehaved or might not have. I am not referring to any particular place; but this is the cycle of events, a deliberate challenge on the violent level, usually accompanied by arson, molestation of people, attacks on those who do not fall into line, burning of trams and buses, looting of shops and defiance of laws like Section 144 and the like. With the police firing there are tragic deaths, sometimes of possibly innocent people, sometimes even of small children who might be around. Then there is naturally a reaction against this and condemnation of the Government for exceeding the limits of legitimate action. What exactly are the limits of legitimate action for the police or for the Army? It is rather difficult to say. Obviously they can be exceeded. When you are dealing with a limited affair it is easy to understand what the limits are, but when you are dealing with uproar all over a great city like Calcutta or Bombay or Madras, then it is rather difficult to judge. Either you allow anarchical conditions, like loot and arson, to gain the upper hand or you do not. If they gain the upper hand, then the whole city will be at the mercy of the hooligan element. The only alternative is for the Government to take steps to stop this at any cost because the cost of not stopping it is terrible for the citizens.

The major question in India today, internally speaking, is this : what is going to be our policy in regard to this growing

violence? I am not afraid of the violence of the hooligan, but of the spirit of violence. Two days ago, on the occasion of the funeral procession in Lucknow of Narendra Deva, a person beloved of all, a policeman was blinded and others were badly injured. Why should this happen? A funeral procession should be an occasion for solemnity. Instead some people threw stones and pushed about and a poor policeman lost an eye completely, apart from some police officers being rather badly injured by stones. I cannot understand this.

We in India appear to have a split personality; we speak unctuously about non-violence, about our culture and *sanskriti* while in our daily behaviour we are coming down to a level which is not a civilized level at all.

A *hartal* may be quite legitimate as an expression of opinion in a certain set of circumstances but may become dangerous and objectionable in another set of circumstances. And I say that at the present moment with these big tensions and bitterness prevailing in various parts of India, it is not patriotic, it is not wise, it is not reasonable to do anything which may lead to violence, even if the Government is at fault.

May I say a few words about the States' reorganization business? Slightly less than two months ago we discussed the matter in this Lok Sabha; there was a very full debate, and I ventured to give expression to my own approach to this question then, too. As I have watched developments in various parts of the country, I have been troubled not by this occurrence or that, but by the atmosphere that is being gradually created. The main problem before me has been how to meet the challenge of the growing violence and bitterness. How can we possibly check it? How can we possibly soothe it?

Some hon. Members have referred, rather caustically, to some kind of a dictatorial approach by four men of the Congress Committee who are supposed to lay down this and that. What exactly is the procedure we followed? I referred to it on the last occasion, and to the multiplicity of these problems. I also pointed out that the problem usually was not one between the Central Government and a certain group or a certain State but between two groups or States.

I shall give you a straight example. Yesterday, Shri N. C. Chatterjee said: "My Chief Minister is giving 500 square miles away." With all respect, I ask: What does that indicate? How is he thinking of giving 500 square miles away? To whom is he giving them away? The S.R.C. Report had made some recommendations and Dr. Roy had agreed.

Here was a conflict in the opinions of the State of West Bengal and the State of Bihar—not with the Government of India, or with the Congress Party. It has not been, by and large, a party matter. Parties have been split on this and there have been several opinions within the parties themselves.

Take this issue of Bengal and Bihar. Here the State of Bihar and the State of West Bengal are thinking in terms of the same patch of territory. It is not a dispute with the Government of India. So far as the Congress is concerned, the Congress of West Bengal is pulling one way and the Bihar Congress is pulling the other way. Presumably the same is the case with other parties too. The provincial pull was greater in their minds than any other pull. There is no harm in the State pull being there, but it is harmful if the State pull is so strong that it leads to violence in speeches and deeds.

Take the case of Orissa. The S.R.C. Report recommended no change in Orissa, this way or that way. I believe Orissa had claims on West Bengal, Bihar, Andhra and Madhya Pradesh. I am not going into the merits of the case at all. Anyhow, those claims were not accepted in the S.R.C. Report; nor did Government wish to go beyond the Report in this matter. The Orissa Government supported those claims, and so did the Congress Party in Orissa. Then there was this rioting in Orissa. Against whom was it directed? Against the Orissa Government which supported the claims of Orissa in the first place. There was no reason or logic in this rioting. People broke into the police station and destroyed things. Young people, aged from ten to twenty years, boys and girls and others participated in this wanton destruction. It is the spirit behind this that I say is deplorable.

Take another case. I can understand the dispute between, let us say, Kerala State and the Madras State about a small patch of territory on the border. One could understand the

proposal to let the patch decide it—I mean the people there. But that is not how the question is viewed. Everybody wants to bring pressure. Somebody in Madras wants to bring pressure by violent activities in Madras so that a small patch of territory five hundred miles away may be attached to Madras State. I am again not going into the merits. I want you to see what such an attitude is leading to. Whether it is in the case of Bengal and Bihar, or Kerala and Madras, or of Madras and Andhra, it generates a feeling which is primarily a feeling that leads to a civil war.

I can assure this Lok Sabha that of the numerous problems that the S.R.C. Report brought out—some of them were major problems and very difficult ones—a great majority have been settled satisfactorily. This is a thing to remember. We must not be overwhelmed by catastrophe here and there. The problems have, by and large, been settled and they have been settled by agreement even though one party did not like that settlement at all. I could give you examples. Take the proposed new Madhya Pradesh. Madhya Bharat fought against it, and was perfectly justified in doing so. But ultimately they all met together and in the larger interests of the country, they came to a settlement and they are pulling through. Take Vidarbha. They were keen on having a separate State. But, at our request, they ultimately agreed to join the Maharashtra State. These are instances of people not getting lost in their own rather narrow desires but looking at the broader picture and ultimately agreeing to something they did not approve of originally. Our approach throughout was one of settlement by agreement. This could only be done informally, and in the course of informal talks we must have met not dozens or hundreds but over a thousand persons, not of the Congress alone but of all groups and parties. Many hon. Members here in the Opposition have been among the people we met, because, as I said, it was not a party matter. It was a matter in which we are seeking some kind of broad agreement in so far as is possible.

Reference was made to the proposal of a union of Bengal and Bihar. I can assure this House that the first time the matter came up was as a result of the terrible shock occasioned

by the occurrences in Bombay. We felt that once we gave vent to bitterness and anger in this linguistic direction, we would be quite lost and would continue to break each other's heads. So came the desire to stop this trend and make people think in a different direction. In this particular matter, I do not know who first started the idea; it was not I. Anyhow it so happened that Dr. Roy and Dr. Srikrishna Sinha and some of their colleagues were here, and they discussed it. They did not do anything about it immediately. They went back to their respective headquarters and then came back five or six days later, having discussed it with their colleagues. It was only then that the proposal was formally put to us. Our answer was: "If you are willing, we are very happy." We did not take a single step about it. There was no kind of imposition. Obviously a thing like this can only take place with the goodwill of all the persons concerned. There can be no imposition in such matters.

Some hon. Members are perhaps not well-acquainted with the development of the Congress outlook on the subject of linguistic provinces. Undoubtedly, in the 'twenties we were strongly in favour of all work being done in the language of the area in order to enable the local people to play their part. In so far as the importance of the language in doing work is concerned, we hold to the same principle. But let us not mix up two things, namely, the importance of the development of a language and linguistic boundaries. The two are not the same thing. If you see the Congress resolutions of the last three or four years, you will find that all of them have stated quite clearly that language is an important factor but that there are other economic, geographical and developmental factors which are equally important. Finally, the most important factor, the overriding factor, is the unity of India. That is what the Congress has been saying all along. Now, seeing all that has happened since the publication of the S.R.C. Report, naturally, and even more than previously, our thoughts have gone towards laying a greater stress on the unifying factors. We have been discussing the Five-Year Plan and thinking more and more in economic and developmental terms.

Take Bengal and Bihar. The area between Bengal and Bihar is the richest industrial area of India, and no doubt in a few years' time it will grow into the most heavily industrialized area. For developmental reasons, it was of very great advantage to Bihar and Bengal to work that area jointly.

We have had enough experience, in the last five years, of small matters being delayed because two Governments had to deal with them and pulled in two different directions. I am merely pointing out that in this case there were valid reasons. Everywhere you will find that the economic approach has now to be considered much more than previously, always making sure that the language approach is also there—not as a boundary but for the purpose of doing work in that language and seeing that the cultural aspect of language is always encouraged. Occasionally it may be that two languages overlap. Suppose Bengal and Bihar form a union. Nothing will happen to the Bengali language or to the work done in Bengali. Nothing will happen to the Hindi language in Bihar. They will function in their respective areas as they did, but in regard to developmental matters it will be a great help. Apart from that it is very desirable that we should have multilingual areas where people automatically get to know more than one language. Absolute linguistic barriers create a certain narrowness in approach.

I wish to say something about Bombay. It is quite wrong for us to go about censuring any community or group for what has happened. That is a wrong approach. There is no doubt what has happened in Bombay is disgraceful. In a similar situation in any other country the Army and tanks would have come in, but in Bombay only police force was used. Bombay has been a tragedy for all of us, but recrimination does not help. I think I should mention just one thing which should be borne in mind by all of us, namely, the trend towards violence. The most important thing now is to calm and soothe the people, to get rid of this bitterness as much as possible.

I do not know how some people have been saying that in my broadcast about States' reorganization I had used the words "irrevocable decisions". I have looked through my broadcast and it is not there. In a democratic structure of

government, there is nothing irrevocable. We can sit down and consider any matter at any time. The point is that we must have the atmosphere to do it. We cannot do it if people beat one another and quarrel. We must calm down. It is obvious that no decision about Bombay is a happy decision which is looked upon by a large section of the people as an imposition on them. If the Gujaratis or the Maharashtrians feel imposed upon, it is not a happy decision. They as well as others have to live together in Bombay. Unfortunately a situation has been created which makes a cool approach to the problem difficult. Let us cool down and become normal and then realize the fact that there is no question of one group dominating over another.

Some people say that a few capitalists in Bombay wanted this to be done and that not to be done. I really do not understand this. For my part, I can say that in the whole course of my conversations, I did not meet a single capitalist from Bombay, though they presented a memorandum which I saw. You can take it from me—you know it well enough—that the capitalists in Bombay or elsewhere will probably be able to function under any conditions.

There has been a proposal about plebiscites. I cannot say that plebiscite should be ruled out in every case. I think in some cases it may be desirable. But it is a dangerous thing to say that you must apply the principle of plebiscite to all these areas. That will produce all kinds of difficulties. We shall have to think of these things, but we cannot think in an atmosphere of violence, extreme ill will and bitterness.

There has been another proposal, for judicial enquiry in regard to Bombay. My reaction is that whenever there is trouble, generally there should be an enquiry. But I must say that my mind is rather confused when I think of an enquiry into the Bombay occurrences. It will be a tremendous enquiry which will last for ages. But apart from that, is it not obvious that this kind of enquiry will raise passions to the utmost? Every party will seek to cast the blame on the other and the result, instead of a process of healing and soothing, will be bitterness, charges and counter-charges. I do not see how any good purpose is served that way.

STATES AND THE NATION

MR. SPEAKER, SIR, a week ago today, I returned to Delhi after visiting many countries and many great cities in the West, and meeting many leading personalities. I tried to understand the great movements that were taking place there, and the thoughts that were passing in the minds of people. Even more so, I tried to understand what image there was of India in the minds of the people I met in Europe.

Even as I watched something of the stuff of history being made in Europe, I wanted to know how far the history we might be making here was reflected in the minds of the European people. I found they were greatly interested in what was happening in India, because they felt it was something very significant, something that would not only change India but affect other countries and continents. From that distance I thought of our work here, of the great problems that face us, and the responsibility of this Parliament in making the history of India.

Another thought that struck me as I travelled from country to country was how the old frontiers gradually had less and less meaning. Within an hour or two, I travelled from the capital of one great country to the capital of another. It seemed to me that despite the many unsolved problems and conflicts, the idea of national frontiers had become less and less important in the modern scheme of things.

I mention this because here we are considering, with great heat and passion, not the frontiers of nations but the borders inside the nation between two States or provinces. If the frontiers of nations have become relatively less important than they were, and if in the course of a few years they may almost be ignored for many matters, how much less important are these problems of State boundaries which we are considering! I do not wish to underrate their importance, but I do wish this House to consider the question in proper perspective. We are apt to lose that perspective in the heat of the debate. I know that this question, and this Bill and its provisions, have

moved people strongly and deeply and that even now there is a great deal of feeling about them. I do not suppose that the most ideal of solutions could possibly have been pleasing to everybody.

So far as the Government and I are concerned, it is of no great significance to us what part of India goes into which State boundary. We must of course decide which course is more desirable, but in the ultimate analysis, it does not make much difference from the Government's point of view where one little part goes. I do not deny that it has a certain importance from the individual's or the State's point of view, but it has none from the national point of view.

The Government of India has approached this question objectively and without any particular desire to impose its decisions. We have been told that we did not go through the proper procedures of consultation and decision. But I think any person who knows what has happened in the last six, seven or eight months in this country will agree that the amount of consultation and discussion that we have had about this matter is without parallel. In fact, many people say that we overdid this; it would have been much simpler if we had not tried to consult hundreds of thousands of persons in this process and thereby perhaps added to the confusion. However, it is a fact that this question has roused people. But I want this House, in the first place, to look at this question in proper perspective, lest we should get lost in the passions of the moment; secondly, to realize that however important these borders might be, they are, after all, administrative divisions inside the country; and thirdly, to remember that whatever we may decide today, nobody prevents us from making any variation subsequently. Nobody wants to change things everyday. At the same time nothing is final in the sense that it cannot be changed in the future.

Our difficulty has been that we have tried, too much perhaps, to balance respective viewpoints and find a common way and as large a measure of agreement as possible. In doing so, we have often succeeded in displeasing many people. Yet I would beg of you to remember that in this very complicated business which has affected the whole of India, by far the

greater part of India has accepted, broadly speaking, the proposals that have been made. It is true that many important questions remain to be solved; among them perhaps the one that has been talked about most is the question of Bombay and Maharashtra.

I have felt that the approach to these questions has been marred by strong language, by direct or indirect reproaches, and by the running down of this group or that. Consideration of these problems is not helped in the slightest by any province or community being run down and by any other part of the country considering itself more capable, more courageous, more independent or more nationalistic. We are all here as Members chosen by some constituency or other in India. Naturally, we are interested in that constituency. But I submit that we are much more. I am not here merely as Member for the eastern part of Allahabad district. I consider a Member of Parliament to be a Member for India. We are not members of some local municipality or district to consider the interests only of our area and forget the rest of India. We have to consider every question in relation to the whole country. As Prime Minister of India I have to think in terms of India. I may make a mistake, as all of us make mistakes. But our *bona fides* must not be called into question. I submit that when we begin to challenge one another's *bona fides*, then any discussion and consideration of a problem on merits become difficult.

Let us realize that even if some decision which we dislike is made, it does not make a great lot of difference. A mistake made in a restricted sphere can be corrected later, whereas the greatest possible error is to have the wrong type of mind.

Some hon. Members may say, "It is all very well; your intentions may be very good, but where have you landed us with your good intentions?" It is perfectly true that we have landed ourselves in a bit of a mess. I admit it and I admit my responsibility for it, because as Prime Minister and otherwise also, I am at least partly responsible for it. I do not wish to run away from it. It sometimes happens that in trying to avoid one difficulty we land in another.

In regard to Bombay and Maharashtra, we varied

previous decisions on several occasions. Each time we varied it we landed in a fresh difficulty. We did it at the suggestion of some respected colleagues of ours and then they themselves wanted something else. Ultimately we landed ourselves in this difficulty that any attempt to change it resulted in probably a worse situation than the first one.

The hon. Member, Shri Deshmukh, said he preferred a City State formula to the present state of affairs. So did we and that was our first decision. And, the hon. Member will remember that on one occasion he told us not only on his behalf but responsibly and authoritatively on behalf of others too that we should adopt the City State formula. We adopted it although we had come to some other conclusion because we were anxious and eager to please. But not 48 hours had passed when we were told, "No; go back upon that; we won't approve that." We went back upon it, and so we shifted about in our anxiety to arrive at some decision which carried the largest measure of agreement and consent.

The hon. Member referred to what he called two crucial decisions which were taken without consultation. I am in a difficulty about this matter because I am really, totally and absolutely unable to follow him. I do not know where he gets his facts from. I consulted my papers, our Cabinet records and everything. There are two decisions—I leave out for the moment the statement that I made in Bombay. The first decision was taken, I may say absolutely and emphatically, with the consultation of everybody and my colleagues in the whole Cabinet. I have no doubt about it. Finally, this Bill itself was placed before the Cabinet. The Bill, after all, contains the decision on Bombay and it was the Cabinet that adopted it before it came to this House. That is the usual procedure. I do not understand how anyone can say, unless he is forgetting all this, that this decision was adopted without consultation. There has been more consultation on this than on any other subject that I have known of since I became Prime Minister.

Shri Deshmukh was kind enough and good enough to say that he did not refer to me when he said that there was a certain animus. I thank him for the statement, but it is a

small matter, after all, what I am and what I may be. But our method of government, the procedure we follow in the Cabinet, in the Government of India, in this Parliament and elsewhere are much bigger matters. Are we following wrong procedures? Are we overriding everybody and imposing some individual will, mine or a small committee's will, over this Parliament, over the Government, over the country? That is a vital matter. It is more vital than, I say, this whole States Reorganization Bill. If we go wrong, how are we to function? It is a serious charge the hon. Member has made. It is not easy to reply to it and to justify my own conduct. But I do submit that he has done little justice to his colleagues in the Cabinet and even less justice to himself when he made that charge. He has functioned in this Cabinet for six years or more and he has been a valued and respected member and colleague of ours. Now, he makes this charge against his colleagues after six years of functioning together. However much I may be guilty of it or deserve it, I submit it is very unfair to all my responsible colleagues in the Cabinet.

Then there is the question of the statement I made in Bombay. What is the crucial point of the statement? I had said at the Amritsar Congress and at various other places repeatedly that Bombay would be given an opportunity to decide, by some democratic process, what it should do and where it should go. For my part, I would be exceedingly happy if Bombay went to Maharashtra. I have absolutely no reason against it and I think there are many good and valid arguments for Bombay going to Maharashtra. But I say there are valid arguments also on the other side. In this difficulty, we thought that the best way was to allow Bombay to decide. It may be done even now. But, as I pointed out, the conditions have been such, and so much passion has been aroused, that it is not yet the right time to decide it. Let things cool down. I have repeatedly said that normality should prevail and then the people should decide. I do not mean that you will necessarily have a plebiscite or referendum and all that; but, if there is a good atmosphere, I have no doubt that it would be far simpler to settle this matter without any such cumbrous procedure. I was hoping for that and I still hope

for that. At the meeting of the All-India Congress Committee in Bombay, I was not, to my thinking, making any announcement of a great decision. I was merely stating what I had stated repeatedly—my view, and I am somebody, after all. A Prime Minister is a Prime Minister, and he can lay down the policy of the Government. I know something about democratic procedure; I know something about party procedure; I know what the Prime Minister's duties are, and in the Constitution that we have and Britain has, the Prime Minister is the linchpin of Government. To say that the Prime Minister cannot make a statement is itself a monstrous statement. I entirely fail to understand where, the hon. Member has got his acquaintance of democracy and of what, under the present Constitution of India and England, the Prime Minister is, what he can do and what he cannot do. I am something more than the Prime Minister; we are all something more; we are the children of the Indian Revolution. And although we may be toned down here and although we may forget much that we did before, we still have something of the revolutionary fire in us.

I venture to say that many of us know a little more about the Indian people, about the peasants, than some others who talk about peasants. We have spent a good deal of our lives with peasants and poor people, and it does not behove any person to talk of money-bags, in the sense of referring to our party or to our Government.

I made that simple statement in Bombay, if I may call it so, to give an assurance that the decision was not final and irrevocable. The statement said in effect, "Let peace be restored first and then this matter may be decided calmly." I do not mind which way it is decided. I am perfectly prepared to plead the cause of Maharashtra with others. 'Animus' is a big word. I have no disinclination towards Maharashtra, but 'animus' is a big word. I attach much importance to this question being solved in a calm manner so as not to leave any headache behind. By all means, let Maharashtra get Bombay in a friendly way, in a co-operative way, and it will be good for Maharashtra, it will be good for Bombay, and good for the country.

The older I grow, the more I feel that the manner things are done is more important than the things themselves. Means are more important than ends. All our trouble in this business has been not that the ends were not good, but that the means employed somehow tarnished the ends, made difficulties and actually came in the way of achievement of those ends. I am not blaming anybody; I am quite prepared to blame myself. But I believe it is a fact that if you employ the wrong methods and gain something, that end is perverted. Because passions had come into play, I wanted the question to be considered in a calmer atmosphere. The more I thought, the more I felt it was good to postpone this particular decision for some time. I say five years, but I am not setting any rigid limit. It is an indication that our minds are not closed on this issue, and that the matter is left open for the future, to be decided when the opportunity arises. It was, to my humble thinking, a hand held out to Maharashtra instead of against it. The day before I made that statement in the All-India Congress Committee, I had the privilege of meeting quite a number of leading gentlemen from Maharashtra, and we talked about these matters. I told them my difficulties and asked them what could be done about the Bill. I said that we could see that the matter was not closed, but was kept open for a period. They asked me whether I would say so before the All-India Congress Committee. I agreed and I made that statement.

It did not convey any firm decision of Government. I know that when a Prime Minister makes a statement, it is important, not casual. But the statement I made, if you examine it, says only that the door is being left open; there is no finality about it. It is a way I found in order to lessen the shock of the Bill for those who do not like it, and to vary or change the Bill a little. That is the purpose, rather than to come in the way of Maharashtra.

Some people have talked about a big bilingual State, and for my part, I welcome it. I do not mind if Bombay is a City State. I do not mind if any chunk of territory were to go from one side to the other. Maybe, there is no sense of provincialism in me. I regard economic and geographical factors as more

important. But the thing that is really important is how linguistic minorities are to be treated. Boundaries are bound to overlap, wherever you might draw them. There are bound to be bilingual and perhaps trilingual areas. How then are linguistic minorities to be treated?

The House will remember that in the Commission's Report, there is a special reference in the concluding chapters to certain measures, certain protections, certain precautions, certain assurances, certain statutory provisions in regard to the linguistic minorities. I am anxious that these should be implemented. Any complaint that people speaking a certain language have not been given protection because they are in a minority must be removed altogether from India, and removed not merely by pious protestations but by active and precise instructions to that effect.

All the fourteen languages mentioned in our Constitution are our national languages—not Hindi only. We have said that Hindi, not because of any linguistic superiority, but because it is spread over a larger area and for other reasons, should be an all-India language; it should, for official purposes, become an all-India language gradually after a certain period. But all the fourteen are national languages. We want to encourage them. The attitude that we can encourage one language by crushing others is completely wrong from the literary or the linguistic point of view. I am convinced that the development of any language in India leads to the development of others. I feel that any kind of application, letter or petition that is presented to courts can be done in any of the fourteen languages of India and no court should reject it. It may be that a court will be unable to deal with it if it is totally unaware of a language—and no court can keep fourteen translators. But a court in Delhi has to accept an application written in Malayalam or Tamil or Telugu or Kannada. Let them get it translated, even if it delays the matter. But the court cannot say it will not accept the document, because it has been written in one of our national languages.

If that is so about every language in India, it should be so especially in regard to the actual languages spoken in a

certain area. They should be given official position in that area, in applications and other matters. After all, Government issues notices so that they may be understood, not with the intention of encouraging or discouraging a language. They should be issued in the languages of that area, regardless, I say, of the percentage of people who speak it, provided of course there are sufficient numbers of people to be approached in that manner.

It is of the utmost importance that, in building the future, we should develop an all-India outlook. The provincial outlook is not going to pay the province, much less India. I may come from U.P., my ancestors might have come from Kashmir, but I consider myself an Indian; I feel that I have inherited every great deed and tradition of India from Cape Comorin to the Himalayas. Sometimes, comparisons are made among people of the various provinces. The people of one province are supposed to be brave, yet others are believed to be businessmen and some others to be *saudagars* and so on. All this thinking is unfortunately the reflex of the caste system—a bane and curse to this country. Which province or State is there in India which does not have a proud tradition of its own? Go to the South, to Tamil Nad; they have a great language and great traditions, military and the rest. Go to Andhra, and they will tell you about the famous Andhra empires of old. Go to the Malayalees; go to the Kannadigas. Whether you go north or south or east or west, each area, each part of India has great traditions, great stories of the past, great culture, even military glory.

I inherit all this legacy. Do you think that I can confine myself to the city of Allahabad, although it is an ancient city, because I was born at Allahabad? I claim to have a right to the glory of Andhra, Tamil Nad, Maharashtra, Gujarat and every other part of India.

Everybody knows the vital part Maharashtra has played in India's history, in military achievement, in scholarship, in literature and finally, in the struggle for freedom. The Maharashtrians or Gujaratis or the Tamilians do not require protection. They are big enough. The people who do require protection are our border people.

Geography has made India what it is, with the Himalayas and the seas protecting it. Whatever internal divisions and dissensions and conflicts we have had in India in the past few thousands of years, the concept of India has remained. The concept of India, Bharat or Hindustan, has remained and has kept us mentally together. Such a concept did not perhaps matter so much in the old days. But the concept of unity does matter today, when we must be integrated not only politically, but emotionally and intellectually. It is painful how in the last few months we have displayed not to ourselves alone but to the world that we are not integrated in our minds and hearts.

Even if it is conceded that the Government of India has committed a mistake, it will take time to change matters. You can of course change the Government of India; you can change the decisions, but remember, above all, that we have to preserve India uninjured in any manner.

As for Bombay, I understand and concede the fairly strong logic on behalf of Maharashtra. There are logical arguments on the other side too, though it may be that one is more powerful than the other. But, I look at it in the context of the present moment, after we have arrived at a certain position through a devious and tortuous way. Are we to go on quarrelling about that, or allow matters to settle down and deal with it in a proper way? According to our Constitution it is always open to this House to deal with a matter whenever it chooses. Apart from that, we are not taking an absolutely final decision. The issue will be open and meanwhile let us keep as many bonds as possible to prevent further conflicts.

A CONSIDERED DECISION

MR. CHAIRMAN, SIR, I am venturing to intervene in this debate on the States Reorganization Bill because of certain remarks that were made by the hon. Member, Dr. Kunzru, yesterday. He referred to certain observations and allegations made by Shri C. D. Deshmukh relating to the manner in which decisions on important issues were made and announced either in this House or elsewhere by certain Members of the Cabinet and the Prime Minister, without the knowledge of their colleagues in the Cabinet, and without collective consideration and decision by the Council of Ministers. I made a statement in the Lok Sabha in regard to these observations. I stated then that the facts as set out by Shri Deshmukh were not correct, but that I did not wish to pursue the matter. I wanted to avoid a controversy which was, to some extent, personal, and further it would not have been possible to pursue the matter without divulging Cabinet proceedings. The Home Minister also referred to this matter in the Lok Sabha and pointed out that Shri C. D. Deshmukh's statement was not correct. My colleagues in the Cabinet were much distressed at the statement made by their former colleague on July 25. They considered the matter at length amongst themselves because the statement cast aspersions on the Cabinet as a whole and on every member of it. It gave a distorted version of the democratic processes at work in India and an erroneous version of the nature and content of cabinet and parliamentary government in this country. The picture drawn by Shri Chintaman Deshmukh about relations between the members of the Cabinet and of lack of collective deliberations and decisions is contrary to the facts and the practice of the Cabinet. Even the few instances cited by him are not in accord with the facts. Matters concerning the reorganization of States have been discussed in Parliament and in the State legislatures, and every interest which considered itself affected has had an opportunity of making known its views, all of which were taken into consideration

Speech during debate on the States Reorganization Bill in Rajya Sabha, New Delhi, August 23, 1956

before the States Reorganization Bill was finally drafted. It might even be said that there was too much, rather than too little, consultation on all important matters with the interests concerned.

The Cabinet discussed this matter on fourteen occasions between September 30, 1955, and May 10, 1956. Shri Deshmukh, to the best of my belief, attended thirteen of them. On the one occasion that he was absent, no decision was in fact taken which affected the future of either Bombay or Gujarat or Maharashtra. On January 8, the Cabinet decided that matters concerning details of certain aspects of the recommendations of the States Reorganization Commission should be considered by a committee of the Cabinet consisting of the Prime Minister, the Minister for Education and the Minister for Home Affairs. Some other Ministers were often invited to the meetings of this sub-committee. Shri Deshmukh attended two such meetings. The committee kept the Cabinet informed from time to time of the progress made in the work and the tentative decisions taken by it. The broad decisions of the Cabinet were made public on January 16, 1956. Only one or two matters had not been decided till then. The States Reorganization Bill was then framed as a whole and as a whole put before the Cabinet. It was twice—on two separate occasions—considered by the Cabinet before it was finally approved on March 8, 1956. That is in so far as the broad question of the Bill and the content of the Bill are concerned. The announcement made by me in Bombay at a meeting of the All-India Congress Committee consisted of a repetition of what had been stated in the States Reorganization Bill, with one addition. This addition was that the City of Bombay could be given an opportunity of expressing its view in regard to its future position in about five years' time. This was not in the Bill nor was it intended to be in the Bill and this statement was in no way isolated from the Cabinet decisions or contrary to them. In fact, it was in keeping with the broad policy which had been repeatedly referred to previously.

Shri Deshmukh also referred to an earlier incident, that is, to the Andhra-Tamil Nad issue. When the formation of

Andhra State was decided upon, the matter had been considered by the Cabinet as early as 1949 before Shri Deshmukh became a Minister and certain steps in the matter of the separation of Andhra were actually taken then. The final decision had to be postponed owing to some unresolved differences among the leaders concerned and because the introduction of our Constitution intervened. The principal question at issue then was about the future of Madras City. When later this question was decided amicably, it was possible for the Prime Minister to refer, in the course of his reply to a question in the Council of States on December 9, 1952, to what was or had been the decision of the Government which had remained pending on account of the afore-said difficulty which had then been resolved. Before the final decision was announced in Parliament, the Cabinet discussed this matter and approved the lines of the announcement which was made in Parliament on December 19, 1952.

It was not my desire to enter into this controversy but I am making this statement in the House in order to remove any erroneous impressions that might have been created in the minds of Members of Parliament or of the public in regard to the way our Cabinet functions and the participation of the members of the Cabinet in the shaping of the policies of Government and decisions thereon from time to time. I feel that it is necessary to do so in the interests of the future of constitutional government in our country and out of regard for the concern that Parliament would legitimately have in a matter of this kind.

NEED FOR FRIENDLY APPROACH

KASHMIR HAS BEEN referred to. You should know that it was India who, right at the beginning, without anybody suggesting it, laid down that the future of Kashmir would be decided by the people of Kashmir. That was a unilateral declaration on India's part right at the beginning. Neither the United Nations nor anyone else suggested it then. We stand by it. When a question has troubled us for a considerable time; you can presume that it is an intricate and difficult question. Obviously I cannot go into the intricacies, except to say that we want that it should be settled in such a way as satisfies the people of Kashmir and that it should be settled in a friendly, peaceful way between the parties concerned, India and Pakistan, but, even more, the people of Kashmir. Kashmir is not a bit of baggage to be thrown from Pakistan to India and from India to Pakistan. My own impression has been that this question might have been solved, or might have been nearer solution some time ago, but for the fact of the intrusion of outsiders into this business. They have taken an unholy interest in it and come in the way of a solution. I think that a direct approach by the parties concerned, i.e., India and Pakistan and Kashmir, is the best way of solving it, rather than letting others come in.

I should like to say another thing about India and Pakistan. Please remember that the people of India and Pakistan, even though they may live in two separate, independent countries now, are not only very near to each other in geography but have innumerable common affinities. In fact, they are hardly distinguishable from each other. If

for the moment we set aside some political problems over which we differ, we meet not as strangers or people from two countries, but as people who have known each other all our lives. We speak the same language, we have the same ideas. We have innumerable friendships and relationships on either side. We are a common people in many ways. That is where the difficulty arises. We are so near to each other that a quarrel assumes the aspect of a brothers' quarrel, which is rather bitter; but nevertheless it is a brothers' quarrel, it is not a strangers' quarrel. Once the approach becomes a friendly approach, then one can go very far. I am happy to say that the general outlook is much more friendly now. So far as we are concerned, whatever our differences might be, we have always avoided taking those differences to the outside world. It is our concern. It is between us that we should settle it.

CHANGE OF GOVERNMENT IN STATE

I HAVE ALREADY informed the House—on two occasions, I think—of certain developments in Kashmir in the course of the last five or six weeks. These developments did not come out of thin air or as a result of some secret conspiracy. Those who had been following events in Kashmir saw this crisis developing for several months past, and the crisis was not so much a crisis *vis-a-vis* India—though we may consider that aspect also—as an internal crisis.

Before I went to Europe in May, I paid a brief visit to Srinagar. I had always kept myself in fairly close touch with events in the State. I went there at the end of May, and I was surprised and distressed to see the internal state of affairs, economic and political.

In the past couple of years, Kashmir has been praised by us for various land reforms, and they were very good reforms.

Speech in the House of the People (Lok Sabha), New Delhi, September 17, 1953

I do not withdraw my praise of them. But unfortunately, while the reforms were good, the manner of giving effect to them was not good. First, the full consequences were not thought of; and secondly, in the actual implementation, as it appears from subsequent reports, a great deal of injustice was done. I refer to this merely to show that a large number of factors produced a feeling of grave economic discontent among the people there. Much later a committee was appointed, the Wazir Committee. Its report was published only recently. It brings out how the land problem was not properly dealt with and shows the discontent that arose after hopes had gone up very high among the peasantry and others. There were other matters, like the failure of co-operatives.

As a result of all this, grave disputes arose within the Government there, and within the party, the National Conference, from which the Government draws its sanction. And when I went there towards the end of May I was greatly distressed to see this, because I noticed that gradually the Government of Kashmir had ceased to function. It could not function because of internal conflicts. Naturally, in a friendly way, I advised them to pull together, to lay down a definite policy and carry it out as a Government, and not pull in two or three directions.

The other thing which gave me a good deal of disquiet was the fact that over a year ago we had arrived at some kind of an agreement with the Kashmir Government which the House knows well. This House approved of it. It was in a very small part given effect to and then the rest remained in cold storage. I could very well understand certain difficulties which, perhaps, the House does not appreciate. I would not therefore have minded if there was some delay. This delay was largely caused by certain events in Jammu which suddenly accentuated a peculiar situation and produced its reactions in the Kashmir Valley. And those who are not friends of ours, or friends of the Kashmir Government, exploited this position fully. This created another serious complication and delayed the implementation of the agreement.

All these things worked together and, as I said, when I went there in May last I was gravely disturbed. But I had to go away to Europe.

When I was away, my respected colleague, the Education Minister, who has been closely connected with developments in Kashmir, and my colleague, the States Minister, who also has been connected with it in his official capacity and who has followed developments there, visited Kashmir. The Education Minister went there at the invitation of the Government and gave them good advice. Nevertheless conditions continued to deteriorate and when I came back reports of this deterioration reached me. I invited Sheikh Abdullah to come to Delhi. In fact, even when I was in Europe I had sent word that he should be invited. On return, I invited him. He did not come; then he said he would come a little later. The invitation was repeated by telephone and later again by letter. Ultimately he did not come. Meanwhile—in fact, before I had come back—Sheikh Abdullah and some others began speaking in a way which seemed strange to me. It distressed us greatly. I could do nothing about it, except to remonstrate with him and ask him why he did so. Obviously he was troubled by the problems to which I have referred, the economic and other complications that had arisen in Kashmir for which he could not see any easy remedy. There were remedies—of course, there are remedies—but he did not see them. So he drifted in a different direction, and rather unfairly cast the blame for some of the economic occurrences on the Government of India through lack of help or whatever it is. Anyhow, the position we took throughout was that it was for the Kashmir Government to decide what policy they would follow. Let their party decide, let the Government decide and have a unified policy. If that policy was in keeping with the Government of India's policy, as we would like it to be, and as we have always endeavoured it to be, well and good. If, on the other hand, the Kashmir Government had a policy with which we differed completely, then it was up to us, the Governments, to sit together and consider, even if we parted company, what we could do about it. I said so to Sheikh Abdullah and other members of his Government.

The fact of the matter was that Sheikh Abdullah himself was in a minority in his Government in these matters, and in a still smaller minority in his party. It was that which produced this element of confusion. So, apart from giving good advice and feeling rather distressed, I felt I could do very little. The situation was developing in this way. Ultimately it blew up, as the House knows, and changes took place.

As I have been connected with Kashmir, politically speaking, for a trifle over twenty years and intimately connected in the Government with all these developments that have occurred during the past six or seven years, the House can well imagine the extreme distress that all these developments have caused me. But it is not a personal matter. We have always regarded the Kashmir problem as symbolic for us, and it has far-reaching consequences in India. Kashmir is symbolic as it illustrates that we are a secular State, that Kashmir, with a large majority of Muslims, has nevertheless, of its own free will, wished to be associated with India. Kashmir has consequences both in India and Pakistan, because if we disposed of Kashmir on the basis of the old two-nation theory, obviously millions of people in India and millions in East Pakistan would be powerfully affected. Many of the wounds that had healed might open out again. Therefore, this problem is not, and has never been, a problem of a patch of territory being with India or not. It is a problem of much deeper consequence.

Kashmir is a place of infinite beauty. What is more, Kashmir is a place of great strategic importance. It has always been a misfortune for a country to be situated strategically, because envious eyes fall upon it. Certainly, so far as we are concerned, it is desirable for us from a strategic point of view that Kashmir should be with us. But however that may be, we cannot impose our desire or wish in this matter. We have put that thought aside, and right from the beginning we have stressed that the people of Kashmir should decide this question. We have held by it, and we hold by it still, that they must decide it in the proper way, in the proper context, not in the way that one would imagine some sections of the Pakistan Press want it done.

We are used to the tone and contents of the Pakistan Press and sometimes to the statements of their people, more or less responsible people, in the past few years, but the actuality in the last few weeks has far exceeded the wildest imagination in this respect. It is amazing that there should be so much hysteria without the slightest justification. I can understand irritation, I can understand strong language, but this type of wild hysteria rather makes one feel that one is dealing with a matter which cannot be dealt with by logic or reasoning or any argument.

As for the kind of so-called facts that are given in the Pakistan Press about happenings in Kashmir, they are so very far from truth that they cannot be called exaggerations. The numbers given as killed in Kashmir, I say, are false, whoever may say it, and there are people who have said it in Delhi. I say, after due enquiry, that these statements of happenings in Kashmir are a hundred per cent false. I say so with full responsibility, having sent our own men, regardless of the Kashmir Government.

Of course, there has been trouble in Kashmir. There have been disturbances and demonstrations. I do not wish to minimize them. Big things have happened and big upsets have taken place because the National Conference which led the national movement all these years has had a sudden split. I should say, taking everything into consideration, that it is surprising that there has been so little trouble there. We have to approach this question with as much calm and wisdom as we possess. It is a difficult question and I repeat that it is going to be decided ultimately by the wishes of the people of Kashmir. Whether it is Kashmir or any other part, we are not going to hold it by strength of arms.

Much has been said about foreign interference in Kashmir. These kinds of charges are often made, and if there is a modicum of truth in them, it is exaggerated. This makes it a little difficult to deal with them. In a matter of this kind, it is not easy for me to state before the House every fact that may come to our knowledge, but broadly speaking I would say that in the course of the last few weeks and months some hard cases of individual interference have come before us. It

should not be correct to call them governmental interference, but individuals have not behaved properly. You must remember the basic fact that Kashmir is a highly strategic area. Many countries are interested in it and they seek sources of information and intelligence. Go to Kalimpong, for instance. It is a nest of spies; there are spies of every country there, and sometimes I begin to doubt if the greater part of the population of Kalimpong does not consist of foreign spies. News comes out of Kalimpong which may sometimes have some relation to truth, but usually it has none. Likewise, in a place like Kashmir, there are interested individuals and there is espionage. Despite all this, it would be unfair for these wild accusations to be made in the press or elsewhere. I suppose some individuals who function in Kashmir try to get contacts, and no doubt sometimes information is passed on from hand to hand. We have checked it often enough, but this kind of thing is inherent in international affairs, and is not peculiar to Kashmir only. It may be that it happens even in the city of Delhi. I don't think it is right for these wild accusations to be thrown about. If there is any trifle of evidence we naturally take action. If there is none, mere shouting is not helpful; in fact, it is definitely harmful.

KASHMIR'S ECONOMIC PROGRESS

KASHMIR is a very big question. Perhaps—why 'perhaps'?—it is the most difficult of all the problems between India and Pakistan. But we must always remember that Kashmir is not a thing to be bandied about between India and Pakistan. It has a soul of its own; it has an individuality of its own. We cannot—much less can Pakistan—play with it as if it were a political game between the two countries. Nothing can be done without the goodwill of the people of Kashmir.

But I might say this. In recent months there has been

Speech during debate on Demands of the External Affairs Ministry,
Lok Sabha, March 31, 1955

very considerable progress in Kashmir. I doubt if Kashmir has been as prosperous for many long years as it is today in regard to food, in regard to other goods, and in regard to development schemes undertaken. There is the Sindh Valley Electric Works which will be extraordinarily useful to the whole Valley of Kashmir. It will assist industrial development and will also facilitate lighting. The value of the Sindh works will be specially realized if it is remembered that the old powerhouse at Mahoba, constructed 40 or 50 years ago, is on the point of collapse. Then we have started the great project, the Banihal tunnel. Numerous small projects are bringing about a new atmosphere in the whole of the Jammu and Kashmir State. It can thus be seen that conditions are more satisfactory in Kashmir both from the political and the economic point of view than they have been for a long time. I do not say that everything is totally satisfactory. But things are on the move.

BASIC FACTS OF THE CASE

I HAVE TAKEN a good deal of the time of the House, but there is one matter I should like to deal with slightly more fully, and that is Kashmir. There has been in the past so much said, so many papers written and so many reports made about Kashmir that we have, I think, about ten bulky printed volumes of these papers. It is impossible to keep pace with them or to remember all the things that have been written. Therefore there is possibly a tendency, not in this House, but generally, of forgetting certain basic facts. I am surprised at the ignorance often shown by eminent foreign observers and by the foreign Press. Whether it is assumed ignorance or not, I do not know, but there it is.

Therefore, I want just to refresh the memory of this House by repeating a few of the salient facts. Hon. Members will

forgive me if I do not mention everything, because I cannot. I do not want anyone to criticize me afterwards for not mentioning some point or other. There are too many of them; the story is too long. But basically, it begins in the last half of October 1947 when there was an invasion of the Jammu and Kashmir State through Pakistan and by Pakistan. Now, there can be no doubt about this aggression by Pakistan. There are many factors which may be argued about; we may say one thing and Pakistan may say another. But there are some facts which, I believe, are above argument. They are established, though there are some persons who argue about everything.

The first established fact is that there was aggression by Pakistan in October 1947 resulting in widespread killing, destruction and loot. This, being the initial fact governing this whole Kashmir affair, must be remembered, because everything subsequent flowed from it. Every decision that may be taken, every consideration that may be given to the Kashmir problem, has always to keep this basic fact in mind.

Quite apart from the position of India in regard to Kashmir—I shall go into that presently—one thing is perfectly clear, that there was no shadow of justification for Pakistan for committing this aggression.

The second fact to be remembered is that legally and constitutionally, Kashmir acceded to India. This also is an undoubted fact. You may criticize the speed with which this was done and the manner of it. But the fact is that legally and constitutionally the State of Jammu and Kashmir acceded to India. Therefore, it became the duty of the Indian Union to defend and to protect Kashmir from aggression and drive out the invaders. I would go a step further and say that even if Kashmir had not acceded to India, even then it would have been our duty to defend it, because constitutionally India was a continuing entity. That is, we were India and we are India. A part of it went out, opted out, let us say, and became Pakistan. We allowed it to opt out. Now, whatever did not opt out remained with India till such time as some other decision was taken. That is, our responsibilities continued in

regard to every part of what was India until that part deliberately and positively became not India. I am even taking into consideration that no final decision had been taken about Kashmir's accession to India; but the fact that it was not in Pakistan itself cast a duty upon us to protect it against any attack. However, this point does not arise because in effect it did accede to India.

Remember that all this was in the first three or four months of our independence. With our background, we were very anxious to avoid military operations. We had to send some troops to Kashmir and I well remember the extreme concern and anxiety with which we considered this question. For two days we considered it. The first day, that is, the day after we got news of this invasion, we met in the Defence Committee and considered it for hours. We were in a very difficult position because we could not obviously and easily send any help. We did not have any proper Air Force then. We waited for a day and half and when we heard further news of this destruction and loot, at great risk and with great difficulty, it was decided—I think at six in the evening in our Defence Committee—to intervene, knowing that it was a very difficult work and involved great risks for us. And all the night preparations were made to send some of our forces. I think we could altogether send some two or three hundred. We had no aircraft; we had to stop all the private airlines and use them. And at six o'clock next morning we sent these two hundred and fifty odd people.

At that time we did not know—though we knew that Pakistan was aiding and abetting these persons—that we were to come face to face with the Pakistan Army. We thought that we would be fighting the tribal people and we thought that two hundred or three hundred would be enough to deal with the tribal people. If I may say so, it was some piece of organizational work, that, with the decision having been taken at six o'clock in the evening, by five o'clock the next morning they were gone. It is not very big if you are an organized country, but just after independence when everything was in a state of flux, it was a difficult feat. These two hundred and fifty or so arrived there almost at the last moment. If they

had arrived twelve hours later, it might have been too late. That is so far as the city of Srinagar was concerned.

These people and other forces that went there drove out those tribal invaders from the Valley up to a place called Uri where they suddenly found something—not just the tribal people, but much more. They found the Pakistan Army entrenched in Kashmir territory. Obviously, it became difficult for our small force—which was at that time perhaps about a thousand—to push out an entrenched regular Army. After that, of course, the operations were between the Indian Army and the Pakistan Army, and the tribal folk faded away and counted for very little.

When we saw this, we gave a great deal of thought to it. As you know, as the House knows, ultimately we referred the matter to the Security Council. Many people have criticized us for doing that. As I said, it is easy to be wise after the event. But I think it was a right step to take and there is no doubt in my mind that the matter would have gone there whether we took it or somebody else took it.

SHRI H. V. KAMATH : Mahatma Gandhi advised against it.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : The hon. Member has mentioned Mahatma Gandhi's name. I do not like to bring in his name but as the hon. Member has mentioned it I shall say something about him in this connection.

When this first invasion took place in Kashmir and we sent our soldiers, I was very greatly worried. All our upbringing had been against war and for peace and our plunging in there and taking these risks of war upset me very much. And, naturally, I went to Mahatma Gandhi to seek his advice. I did not wish to drag him into the picture but I could not help doing it as long as he was there. His advice was that in the circumstances it was the duty of India to go to the rescue of Kashmir and to go with Armed Forces.

Subsequently, when we had decided or were considering the question of our going to the United Nations, I remember taking to him the draft which we had prepared of the memorandum for the United Nations and showing it to him and consulting him about the phraseology. I think he made some suggestions which we tried to embody. It is not fair for me

now or at any time to take shelter under Gandhiji's advice in this matter and I do not wish the House to imagine that I am doing so. But the hon. Member opposite mentioned his name abruptly. I only wish to say that the decision was ours, not Gandhiji's, but at no time did I lose touch with him or his counsel in this matter. And we tried to adapt our own views, as far as we could in the circumstances, to his advice. When this case went to the Security Council, Pakistan submitted long memoranda which were supported later by very long speeches. In these memoranda it was stated very stoutly and very strongly that Pakistan had not committed any aggression or invasion, or aided or abetted anybody in committing aggression. There was a complete and total denial of what we said. Having done that, they brought in all kinds of other issues; they talked about genocide, not in Kashmir but in Delhi, Punjab and all over; they talked about Junagadh and some other States in Kathiawar.

In fact, the greater part of the memoranda dealt not with the Kashmir issue, which they slurred over and about which they said they had nothing to do, but with other matters. It will be interesting for the House to remember that they asked the Security Council to consider and decide all these questions, genocide, Junagadh, and so on, together with Kashmir, simultaneously. I am repeating all this to show the mental attitude of Pakistan. First they completely denied everything, and only a little later they had to admit what they had denied. Then they tried to divert the mind of the Security Council to entirely different problems which we had not mentioned and which had not arisen in that connection. I must confess that I was very much taken aback by this tissue of lies that had been put forward by the Pakistan representative before the Security Council. Naturally, we tried to answer that in terms of fact; we produced pictures and proofs. It is interesting for this House to know that lately, in the last year or so, there have been quite a number of statements from prominent people in Pakistan, particularly in the North-West Frontier Province of Pakistan, giving details of how they organized this raid from Pakistan; and demands have been made by one party in the North-West Frontier Province on the

other for the amount spent in organizing it. Also, only recently there was a statement by one of the leading officers admitting this participation. I am merely pointing out how Pakistan was basing its case in the Security Council; it is something which can only be described as completely false and they had to admit it as false later. When the U.N. Commission came here, then it became quite impossible for Pakistan to say that their forces were not there—because the U.N. Commission would see them there. It was then that they admitted the presence of their forces. They said it subsequently, not at the outset. They might have made this admission in the U.N. debate which was taking place only a little earlier, but they did not do so. It was only under compulsion, when they were going to be found out completely, that they admitted it.

In the Resolution of August 13, 1948, the Commission proposed that :

“As the presence of troops in the territory of the State of Jammu and Kashmir constitutes a material change in the situation since it was represented by the Government of Pakistan before the Security Council, the Government of Pakistan agrees to withdraw its troops from the State.”

This was the Commission's recommendation. Please observe the language; it is mildly put. “As the presence of troops in the territory of the State of Jammu and Kashmir constitutes a material change in the situation since it was represented by the Government of Pakistan” is a mild way of saying that they had told a lie in the Security Council but that the Commission found the troops here. That is what is meant by a material change in the situation. Privately the Commission people told us that a lot of falsehood had been stated and that there was complete aggression; but they added, “We have come here to settle the matter peacefully and if we go about publicly condemning everybody, it will become difficult to settle it.” So, they tried to avoid giving expression clearly to their finding on aggression, which they admitted and which, in fact, indirectly they stated too.

The point now to remember is that because of this admission of aggression, the first thing the Commission required

was that Pakistan should withdraw its Armed Forces from the area of the State occupied by it. That was the first thing. There was a great deal of talk about plebiscite and a good deal of talk as to what India should and should not do. But throughout this period, the first demand of the United Nations has been in every respect the withdrawal of Pakistan Forces from that area occupied by them. Other factors came later. We were asked to withdraw the bulk of our Forces later, that is, on Pakistan withdrawing from that area. We were asked, to relieve tension, to withdraw the bulk of our Forces, but retain our Army in the State in order to give it protection. The right of our Army to be there was recognized, but it was stated that since Pakistan was withdrawing completely from Jammu and Kashmir State, India also could reduce her Forces as that would tend to bring about a better atmosphere. The point I wish the House to remember is that the first essential was the withdrawal of Pakistan's Armed Forces from that area of the State which they had occupied. Today, eight and a half years after that, those Armed Forces are still there. All this talk of plebiscite and other things is completely beside the point. In fact, those questions would arise only when Pakistan had taken a certain step, that is, withdrawal of Armed Forces. And Pakistan is out of court till it performs its primary duty by getting out of that part of the State on which it has committed aggression. This is a major fact to be remembered. There were many other prerequisites for a plebiscite. Well, many attempts were made. They did not yield results. But the Government of India and the Government of Jammu and Kashmir State could not remain continually in a state of suspended animation in regard to Kashmir; something had to be done. Certain steps were taken by the Jammu and Kashmir Government with the concurrence of the Government of India, to elect and convene a Constituent Assembly. That was done. We stated even then that actually the Constituent Assembly was free to decide any constitution it liked but we made it clear that we continued to be bound by our international commitments.

More years passed and while on the one hand Pakistan continued to occupy a part of the State on which they had

committed aggression, the Constituent Assembly proceeded to draw up the Constitution of the State and it passed very important measures of land reforms. Great development works were undertaken and the people of the State, except those under the forcible occupation of Pakistan, made progress. The people of Jammu and Kashmir experienced more prosperity under their own Government than they had at any time previously in living memory or before. A very simple test of this is the number of visitors who went to Kashmir last year—fifty thousand, an unprecedented number.

Eight or nine years have passed, and the people of Kashmir have settled down to work. The Governor-General of Pakistan—I mean, the President—and others repeatedly talk about the abject slavery of the people of Jammu and Kashmir State under the present regime. I really do not know why they should talk in this irresponsible manner. Jammu and Kashmir State is not a closed book. Fifty thousand tourists have gone there and if there is one thing which is well established, it is that the State has never been so prosperous before.

It is not for me to say what the state of people on the other side of the cease-fire line is. But I notice that there is a continuous attempt by people on that side to come over to this side and share in the prosperity.

We were discussing various ways of settling the question with the Prime Minister of Pakistan when a new development took place. This was the promise of military aid from the U.S.A. to Pakistan—a promise which was subsequently fulfilled. This created not only a new military situation but a new political situation; and the procedure thus far followed by us became out of date and had to be viewed afresh. That situation has become progressively worse because of the flow of this military aid to Pakistan and the conclusion of the SEATO and Baghdad Pacts. Apart from the legal and constitutional issues, we have this practical aspect to remember in discussing the question of Kashmir with Pakistan representatives and others. We want to promote the happiness and freedom of the people of Kashmir and we want to avoid any step being taken which would be disruptive, which would upset things that have settled down and which might lead to

migration of people this way or that way and which, further, would again lead to conflict with Pakistan. There is no settlement of the Kashmir problem if the manner of settling it leads to fresh conflict with Pakistan. As things settle down, any step which might have been logical some years ago becomes more and more difficult; it means uprooting of things that have become fixed, legally, constitutionally and practically.

We pointed this out the last time the Prime Minister of Pakistan came here. I told him: "You can talk to me; you have talked for the last five or six years about these pre-conditions laid down previously in the U.N. Resolution. We have not come to an agreement. The departure of the Pakistan Armed Forces itself has not taken place. I am prepared to talk to you, if you like, on the subject, but it is not very likely that, when we have failed for the last five or six years, we are likely to come to a rapid agreement, more especially when new factors have come into the picture." All our previous discussions had to be abandoned because the basis of discussion had changed. I told him that facts had to be recognized as they were. It was no good proceeding on the basis of old things, ignoring the existing facts.

Meanwhile, another thing has been happening. Developments have taken place both in our Constitution and that of the Jammu and Kashmir State. As hon. Members will perhaps remember, we have laid down in our Constitution that we could not agree to any change in regard to the Jammu and Kashmir State without the concurrence of the Jammu and Kashmir Constituent Assembly. That is the constitutional position. I pointed this out to the distinguished representatives from Pakistan who came here.

The creation of one unit in West Pakistan also concerns the people of Kashmir indirectly. Now, as a consequence of all these factors, I made it clear to the Pakistan representatives that while I was prepared to discuss any aspect of this question, if they wanted to be realistic they must take into consideration all that had happened during these seven or eight years and not talk in terms of eight or nine years ago. They did not quite accept that position and there the matter ended.

The only alternative, I said, was a continuance of the deadlock in our talks. I had offered some time ago a no-war declaration to the Pakistan Government to the effect that under no circumstances would India and Pakistan go to war for the settlement of any dispute. There was considerable correspondence. Nawabzada Liaquat Ali Khan, who was the Prime Minister then, did not agree to that and he said: "Before you make that declaration, you must settle the questions at issue or you must agree to their being settled by some process like arbitration." I pointed out to him that I would very gladly settle these questions but various attempts had already been made which had not succeeded. I thought that by a no-war declaration a new atmosphere would be created which would help us in settling them. I said, "Let us consider advance on both lines." Further I said, "When you want me to bind myself down to a strict schedule there will be possibility of disputes arising. When a dispute arises it is referred to conciliation which might take a month or two, then to mediation which might take a couple of more months, and then to arbitration." I said I was not aware of any country having committed itself in advance to arbitration about any problem that might arise in the future.

The present Prime Minister of Pakistan has again mentioned this matter and I gladly welcome his proposal. But it is clear that we must not tie ourselves in a no-war declaration with all kinds of conditions. Then you get into a vicious circle. You are asked to settle first and then make a no-war declaration; but if you settle everything then it is not necessary to have a no-war declaration or arbitration.

I want to be quite frank with this House and with the Pakistan Government. Having had nine years' experience of this Kashmir affair in all its changing phases—a problem that is affecting the people of Jammu and Kashmir State, affecting India in a variety of ways, affecting our Constitution and our sovereignty and affecting our vital interests—am I to be expected to agree to some outside authority becoming an arbitrator in this matter? No country can agree to this kind of disposal of vital issues. I do think that if both Pakistan and we are agreed that on no account should we go

to war with each other but should settle our problems peacefully, they may not be settled for some time, but it is better to have a problem pending than to go to war for it. Therefore, it would be very desirable and helpful to have a no-war declaration.

One thing more. The Pakistan President said with great force that in all these border incidents, in every one of them, India was guilty. Well, any number of incidents have occurred. I cannot discuss each one of them. But at least in regard to ten incidents on the Jammu border the United Nations Observers have stated that Pakistan was the aggressor. I take their word for it. But I shall repeat what I said here the other day in my statement on the Nekowal incident. The Nekowal incident stands out in a stark manner not because twelve persons were killed, but in the way it has been dealt with by the Pakistan Government. The present President of the Pakistan Republic was in Delhi when we received the report of the U.N. Observers in regard to this incident. It was handed over to him and to the then Prime Minister. They assured us, and in fact the Prime Minister stated so in public, that they would deal with and punish those who were found guilty by the U.N. Observers. What Pakistan had to deal with was not our opinion, but the opinion of the U.N. Observers, arrived at after an enquiry. Pakistan itself said that the guilty would be punished. I am astonished that a year or more has passed and nothing has been done. I am still more astonished that statements should be made to the effect that we are the aggressors in all these incidents.

I am afraid I have taken a great deal of the time of the House, but I wanted to refer to the Kashmir matter in some detail and to bring out some basic facts. I hope that the Government and the people of Pakistan will consider these basic facts and realize that we mean no ill to them. It will be absurd for us to mean any ill to them because our prosperity is connected with their prosperity. We want to be friends with them. We want to settle all our problems in a friendly way and I am sure we can settle them if their approach is a friend's approach.

WELL-BEING OF THE PEOPLE—THE PRIMARY CONSIDERATION

I FIND THAT some of our people tend to get excited about the Kashmir issue. That does not help us in considering serious problems. Some Members of Parliament have suggested to me that a session of Parliament must immediately be convened to consider recent developments in the Kashmir problem. I do not see any need for doing so. Some have even suggested postponement of the elections and amendment of the Constitution to enable the present Parliament to carry on for a year or two more. I disagree. The elections will be held, whatever happens. We are a mature people, and can carry on with our Constitution and our democratic working and at the same time tackle serious problems. We are not going to run away from the elections because of happenings in other countries or because of dangers threatening us.

In fact, I think this situation makes it all the more necessary for us to have elections so that the country may give its verdict on this policy which we can pursue with single-minded vigour afterwards. We need not get excited or develop cold feet. We have no cold feet; we have stout arms and, I hope, stout hearts and calm heads. Nevertheless, it is true that some recent developments in this Kashmir problem have caused us concern. We are also distressed because this problem which has existed for nine years now has been dealt with very casually in the Security Council recently. It is a problem which has roused people emotionally in Pakistan, in India and, most of all, in Kashmir itself. But we cannot solve problems by sentiment. Where there is this strong emotional background, where there is a nine-year history involving all kinds of legal and practical problems and the immense consequences of any action that might be taken, then, it seems to me, wisdom requires something more than casual consideration and casual decision.

Our case was presented before the Security Council by my colleague Krishna Menon, and I want to tell you that he

did this work brilliantly and most effectively, and the line he took there represented completely our views on the subject. I say this although it was not necessary for me to say so. A colleague and representative has naturally to say what we jointly feel. Nevertheless, I want to say it because there are some people in this country and some people in other countries whose job in life appears to be to try to run down Krishna Menon, because he is far cleverer than they are, because his record of service for Indian freedom is far longer than theirs, and because he has worn himself out in the service of India. It is not necessary for them or for me or for you to agree with Krishna Menon in everything, although he is my close colleague. I do not agree with T. T. Krishnamachari although he is a close colleague. We do not agree with each other in everything. But we do agree in our broad approach to problems, and we do believe in each other's *bona fides* and integrity. Otherwise we cannot co-operate. But this kind of repeated and persistent attempt to undermine our policy by throwing mud at a colleague of ours seems to me not very desirable or proper.

It is because of this, I want to tell you, that though Krishna Menon is a member of the Rajya Sabha, and it was not necessary for him to seek election, yet we have agreed to his seeking election from the City of Bombay, for Bombay is a cosmopolitan city and we want our foreign policy to be voted upon in Bombay. It is for the people to say whether they agree with our foreign policy or not. It is our challenge to those who disagree with our foreign policy. We do not run away from criticism.

The Kashmir question is complicated. What are the basic issues involved? There are many, but in my view the basic issue about Kashmir is the good of the people of Kashmir. Nothing else counts. If it comes into conflict with other issues that count, then I, as the Prime Minister of India, necessarily have to take into consideration the interests of India. I have no business to relinquish or throw away the interests of India because of some sentiment. Nevertheless, I say that the major consideration for me and for my Government has been the good of the people of Kashmir. Some people, chiefly in foreign

countries, and sometimes even in India, refer to moral standards and say: "Mr. Nehru who pretends to be a high moral figure, doling out moral advice to everybody in the world, forgets his own morality when he deals with Kashmir; he has a double standard." Well, it is very difficult for me to know my own failings, but I am not personally conscious of any double or separate standard. If I had deliberately judged Kashmir by any different standard, then indeed I would have stood condemned not only before other countries, but before my own people and above all before myself. I think that on moral issues India stands rather well over the Kashmir matter.

Look at the history of the case. Invasion through Pakistan and later by Pakistan; destruction, arson, loot, robbery, murder by people coming through and from Pakistan. This is the beginning of the story of the Kashmir issue, a story which goes back over nine years. It is also known that immediately after that, Kashmir acceded to India. According to us and many others it became our right and duty to protect Kashmir. Quite apart from it, if we had not done this at that time, Kashmir would have been a smoking ruin and there would have been large-scale war between India and Pakistan.

I know how troubled I was at that time. All our background had been one of non-violence and peace. Were we, immediately after independence, to be dragged into war? It was a terrible thing and yet there was Kashmir being looted, its people being murdered, there was arson and frantic appeals came to us from the people of Kashmir, apart from the Ruler. It was a very difficult decision to take. Fortunately we had Gandhiji with us at that time. I am not using Gandhiji's name to entangle him in this matter. I do so merely to tell you that as usual I ran to him for some advice and light. I believe he also spoke publicly about this matter. He told us it was our duty to go to the help of the people of Kashmir. He, a man of peace, told us so. We went to Kashmir and we found that it was not an attack by mere raiders only, but that the Pakistan Army had entered Kashmir. We found we had undertaken something big. The normal consequence of this would have been war with Pakistan. They had come in

and had committed aggression. Whatever argument one may use about the State's accession to India or about India's right to have troops in Kashmir, there is absolutely no argument, even a flimsy one, to justify Pakistan's action in sending troops there. There is no doubt from any point of view that it was aggression by Pakistan and we were entitled in law and fact to attack Pakistan all over. We were much stronger than Pakistan militarily. But we did not attack them. It was to avoid war with Pakistan that we went to the Security Council. Even there we expressed ourselves moderately, in asking Pakistan not to encourage aggression over India. Never in these nine years have we had an answer to this question. The Security Council and their Commissions did say this and have said clearly that Pakistan had in a sense committed aggression. They admitted the right of India and the Government of Jammu and Kashmir to sovereignty over the territory of Kashmir, even over the territory which Pakistan is occupying. All these are on record. But they said that it was more important for us to come to an understanding than for them to condemn anybody. We agreed, but we said: "Pakistan has done us grievous wrong, but we do not want to condemn Pakistan because we want to live in peace with Pakistan; we want to be friends and we are neighbours." So time and again we have moderated our policy. We did not put forward the principal facts with all the vigour that we could have commanded. We talked about many other matters. Then we agreed to a plebiscite on certain conditions, in a certain context of events. The very first condition was the withdrawal of the Pakistan Army from the territory of Jammu and Kashmir State. There were many other conditions; but that was the first because the aggression had to be purged before we could take any other step. That was the principal proposal in the U.N. resolution which dealt ultimately with the plebiscite and many things else. First, there was to be a cease-fire, then a truce; then other measures and then plebiscite. But immediately after the cease-fire, as part of the truce, Pakistan's armies had to withdraw from the territory they had invaded. They have not done that to this day. I am told today that India comes in the way of a plebiscite, that we have not

fulfilled or honoured our international commitments. If Pakistan says so, I can understand it, because Pakistan is in the habit of making entirely irresponsible and even untrue statements. But it surprises me and pains when others say so. What international commitments have we not honoured? If I am convinced that I have not honoured any international commitment, either I shall honour them or I shall resign my Prime Ministership of India and retire. Let others run India.

During all this period we have discussed these matters with Pakistan. Sometimes they have made suggestions, we have made offers and they have made counter-offers and this question of plebiscite has been discussed as also the question of conditions relating to it. All this has been in the nature of discussions as to how to solve the problem.. Once or twice some steps were agreed to, but the steps were not implemented by Pakistan. In such circumstances any offer would be in the nature of a conditional offer. First of all, the offer was strictly conditional. Secondly, it could not last for ever and ever. Conditions change and in these nine years conditions have changed very greatly. For three years we waited and then we said: "We are not like Pakistan to carry on without Constitution or without elections." The Jammu and Kashmir people had a Constituent Assembly to frame a Constitution and held elections for that Assembly. After five or six years' deliberations, they have framed a Constitution for the State. The question of accession of Kashmir to India was really decided in 1947. So far as the Constitution is concerned, it has confirmed the accession. Even this confirmation was done a few months ago. Therefore nothing startling was going to happen on January 26 this year, and yet there was tremendous noise that something new was going to happen on that date and a resolution was hustled through the Security Council, even without an attempt to understand what exactly would happen on January 26. As you all know, the resolution which the Council passed had been drafted and was in existence even before they bothered to hear our representative. That is what I call a casual way of dealing with an important question.

After drafting the Constitution of Jammu and Kashmir,

the Constituent Assembly has ceased to exist. Just as we are holding our national elections, they are going to hold elections in Jammu and Kashmir. You will see that we have thus made great advance, not in the old sense of plebiscite, but in getting people to elect their representatives. The new elections in the State will be held in a month or two, and I am confident they will be fair and impartial. The Prime Minister of the Jammu and Kashmir Government has invited foreign journalists and our own pressmen to see the elections for themselves. Last year 70,000 tourists visited Kashmir. There is no iron curtain or any other curtain there. You can also go there, any of you, and see for yourselves.

But what has happened on the other side? The area of Kashmir which is occupied by Pakistan has had no election. In fact, look at Pakistan itself. They have had no true election there for nine years, ever since they got Pakistan. They talk loudly about plebiscites elsewhere. But in their own country they have not been able to have true elections all these nine years. After very great effort they prepared a Constitution some months ago, but no elections have yet been held. Note that Azad Kashmir, that poor area, has had no chance of elections and it has been incorporated into Pakistan. That is another interesting thing for you to remember. There has been all this great fuss about the Jammu and Kashmir Government framing its Constitution, in which it reiterates a fact that has been there all along, namely, accession to India. But when the Pakistan Constitution incorporated that part of Jammu and Kashmir which is in their possession nobody shouted. The Security Council did nothing at the time. All I can say is, the Council has not applied its mind to this question. It is extraordinary for people to say that we have come in the way of plebiscite. No plebiscite could be held because none of the conditions was fulfilled. The plebiscite was to cover both sides. We got stuck even on the preliminary condition of withdrawal of forces. The Pakistan forces had to go root and branch before further steps could be taken.

Meanwhile a new development took place—the supply of arms to Pakistan in considerable quantities from the United States of America. The United States has every right to supply

arms to Pakistan, and Pakistan, I suppose, has every right to take them. They are independent countries and I have no right to object. But that supply of arms made a great difference to the situation in Kashmir. We told this to the Pakistan Government and other Governments. But we were told—I can believe their word—that these arms were not to be used against India and that they were intended to be used against aggression. I accept that. But how can even the great U.S. Government check their use? Every day I read in Pakistan papers exhortations to the effect: "Let us have war now that we are strong." They have heavy armour. They have plenty of the latest types of aeroplanes. And they live on a fare of hatred and violence. Naturally this causes us concern. I do not want you to reply in kind. I do not want our students to do what the students in Pakistan did or are doing. As a responsible Government, we have to take all these factors into consideration. They have built airfields in Gilgit, Muzaffarabad and other places, which is completely against the cease-fire arrangement or resolutions of the U.N. Council. Gilgit is in the heart of the Central Asian mountains. The mere fact that all these big airfields have been built, apart from anything else, is a serious matter. Nobody talks about these things because we have taken up as accommodating an attitude as possible. All our virtue in accommodation is forgotten. They try to bind us down to it. They tell us not to go into the past or into the question of aggression, but only to talk about the plebiscite to which they tell us we agreed. Even the conditions governing the plebiscite are forgotten. I say that this is most extraordinary. The welfare of vast numbers of human beings of Kashmir is involved and I do not want any final decision which is against the interests of Kashmir people. I do not want to ask for a decision on a legal issue. But when I am charged with dishonourable practices, when the charge is made by Pakistan and, to some extent, by other countries that I have abrogated my commitments, I have a right to state what the legal position is. I am not overstressing it, but merely stating it. I have a right to demand a decision on this basic issue of aggression, because it might recur at any time.

We have to look at the practical and factual aspect. Krishna Menon spoke for nine hours. But there was no reference in the subsequent speeches made by others to the points Krishna Menon had raised. The Council has merely passed a resolution as if nothing has been said on our behalf. This is strange. What should concern us and the Security Council and the world is that nothing should be done in Jammu and Kashmir State which, instead of solving the problem, creates greater problems. Nothing should be done which upsets things. Nothing should be done which might bring before us the horrors of August, September and October 1947. That is the governing consideration in our minds. Every step we have taken has been guided by that thought. Take even this question of plebiscite. From the first day we have been telling the U.N. Commission and Pakistan: "If the conditions we lay down are satisfied and if there is complete peace and order, we are prepared to have a plebiscite." I tell you in all honesty, that under fair and peaceful conditions, and conditions wherein religious fanaticism is not allowed play, I have no doubt that a great number of people of Kashmir in a plebiscite would vote for India. We have laid stress always that this election or plebiscite must be on political issues and on economic issues. We do not want communal riots in the State and call them a plebiscite. We do not want a raging campaign based on religious bigotry. We do not want passions to be roused. This question of Kashmir therefore becomes one of deep significance in that any wrong step taken will upset many things in the whole of India and in the whole of Pakistan. We have never accepted and we do not propose to accept the two-nation theory on which Pakistan was founded. Remember that when in the days before Partition, the Muslim League in India flaunted this theory, the Kashmir people rejected it, because Kashmir has been throughout history a place of very little communal tension. Hindus, Muslims and Buddhists have lived together in amity in Kashmir, whether the ruler has been Muslim or Hindu. Their religions might be different but their accomplishments and customs are similar. They live together and they meet together. Even when India was at the height of

communal frenzy, in August 1947, Kashmir was calm. I do not want Kashmir, in the name of plebiscite, to be now made the scene of a fratricidal war. Such a war will spread to other parts of India and upset the delicate balances that have been established. It is a matter, therefore, of the utmost concern and consequence to us that no step is taken in Kashmir which will have these tremendous reactions, like refugees streaming into Pakistan and refugees streaming into India and so on. Such a solution would be no solution of the Indo-Pakistan problem, but a worsening of the situation. Judging simply from the point of view of consequences, we must realize that no responsible person or authority can think of a step which will create these grave upsets in the lives of India and Pakistan and which will probably ruin Kashmir.

Pakistan talks about a plebiscite. It would be becoming to have its own elections before talking about election in Kashmir. Pakistan has called in many countries in support. Many of them are its allies. We do not approve of military alliances like the Baghdad Pact because they have caused a great deal of uncertainty. It is possible that these military alliances account for the strange resolutions that have been passed in regard to Kashmir. Some at least of the countries of the Baghdad Pact, indeed many, are supposed to belong to the Free World. I venture to ask, in all respect, whether they have elections. Do they have a free Press? Do they have the right of free assembly? It is the "free world" which calls for elections and plebiscite when these countries have themselves no election and have authoritarian systems of government. It is a strange world, my friends. It pains me that countries which are friends of ours—because we are friendly with all countries—should have considered this question in so casual a way. I hope that they will give more thought to it in the future. It pains me that all this hatred and passion are roused in Pakistan. It is not good for us, of course; but it is much worse for Pakistan. All our minds are concentrated on building up our country and implementing our Second Five-Year Plan. We do not want it diverted to other matters. If I can help it, I would not take part in any international dispute or issue; but I cannot help it when issues concerning us come

up. Unfortunately Pakistan's mind is tied up in this way with violence and hatred against India. I hope the people of Pakistan will get over it. At any rate we are not going to reply in kind. We will continue to be friendly with them. Only the other day, while all this was happening, we signed a trade pact in which we went as far as we could to oblige Pakistan. We shall continue this policy because we consider it basically the right policy.

I told you at the beginning that we need not develop cold feet about these matters. Getting excited helps us at no time, much less in a serious situation, when we have to keep our minds right. The best way for us is to work and strengthen the country through the Five-Year Plans. That is what you should remember at the forthcoming elections. Answer the challenge in the way that I have suggested to you. That is the proper way.

FOREIGN INTERFERENCE

REFERENCES HAVE BEEN MADE to the question of atomic weapons in Pakistan both by my colleague, Shri Krishna Menon, in the Security Council, and by me here on previous occasions. But our references were based not on any secret information—we leave that out—but on certain official statements or speeches by the Pakistan Commander-in-Chief. We did not say that they had atomic weapons, but we only said what the Pakistan Commander-in-Chief himself had said, that in their military exercises last December, the use of tactical atomic weapons was envisaged and exercises were carried out from that point of view. That is a preparatory stage for the use of atomic weapons. I repeat that I did not say that Pakistan had atomic weapons, and the United States Government has since denied having given any atomic weapons to Pakistan, or, indeed, to any other country.

From a speech during debate on Foreign Affairs, Lok Sabha, March 25, 1957

Naturally, we accept that denial, but the fact remains that these preparations and exercises and the possible use of them are matters of some concern to us, more especially when all this is tied up with the large-scale military aid which comes from the United States to Pakistan, and which has made a great deal of difference to the problems between India and Pakistan. It is my conviction that it would have been far easier for Pakistan and India to solve their problems, difficult as they were, after Partition, if other outside countries had not interfered, whether in the matter of Kashmir or in any other problem. I am not for the moment criticizing outside countries because often they have acted with goodwill in this matter. But goodwill or not, the fact is that this interference has come in the way of these two neighbouring countries solving their problems.

Then there were some questions, I think, enquiring if Pakistan had annexed the area of Kashmir in Jammu and Kashmir State occupied by them. The answer is yes. Even in their Constitution they have stated that all the administered areas are part of Pakistan, and undoubtedly this is one of their administered areas. So that, for a long time past practically, and later even constitutionally, they have treated this as an area which is part of Pakistan. It has been surprising that little reference has been made abroad to this annexation of nearly half of Jammu and Kashmir State, while a great deal of discussion has taken place about what is called the 'annexation' of Kashmir State by India. There has been no annexation by us. The word is completely wrong and inappropriate. There was accession, as the House knows, in October 1947; the circumstances leading to it may have been different, but it was an accession in exactly the same way as was applied to the hundreds of other States in India. It was the same legal, constitutional way. Nothing has happened since then to lessen that factor, and nothing was necessary to add to it.

There were also questions about Gilgit and a story that was published in the press, emanating from Brigadier Ghansara Singh. We, of course, had known this story for a long time. Brigadier Ghansara Singh was sent by the Maharaja

of Kashmir, the Ruler then, under an agreement with the British just prior to Partition. They had handed over Gilgit to the Jammu and Kashmir Government, and this Brigadier was sent there to take charge. Some very extraordinary things happened when he went there. Soon after his arrival, after two or three days, he was arrested by the Gilgit Scouts who were under the command of British officers. The British officers of Gilgit had acceded to Pakistan! The story was a very odd and curious one. Brigadier Ghansara Singh was kept in prison there for a considerable time. We had met him when he came out and he had given us this story then. It is now given to the public.

I should like to make another thing clear. We have been asked as to the Government of India's position in regard to the Pakistan-occupied territory of Kashmir, and what we propose to do about it. It is clear that in every sense, legally and constitutionally, by virtue of the accession of the Jammu and Kashmir State to India, the whole State has acceded, not a bit of it only; and therefore, according to that accession, the whole State should form part of the Union of India. That is the legal position.

We may have, in the course of these nine years, in our extreme desire to come to some peaceful arrangement, discussed various suggestions and proposals. But those discussions did not lead to any result. There they ended, although, sometimes, something that we said in the course of discussions, some idea or proposal or thought that was thrown out, is held up to us as a kind of commitment.

We have stated in the Security Council and outside too that we for our part are not going to take any steps involving the armed forces to settle the Kashmir problem. If we are attacked, we shall, of course, defend ourselves. Indeed we have made it clear that if we are attacked in Kashmir, we will consider it an attack on India. But we have also made it clear that while we consider the Pakistan-occupied part of Kashmir legally and constitutionally a part of the Indian Union territory, we are not going to take any military steps to recover it or recapture it. We have given that assurance and we shall abide by it.

There were also questions about some messages that had come to me from the Prime Ministers of Ceylon and China in regard to the Kashmir issue. As for the messages, the House will remember that the Prime Minister of China went to Ceylon and the two Prime Ministers issued a joint statement. In the course of that statement, they have made a friendly reference to the Kashmir issue and hoped that this would be settled by mutual discussions or contacts between the two countries concerned, without interference from other countries. That was a friendly wish from two friendly countries. And so far as I know, there is nothing more that has followed from it or was intended to follow.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

A. GENERAL

THE FAR EASTERN POLITICAL CONFERENCE

THE HOUSE knows that the name of India came up repeatedly before the Political Committee of the United Nations some time ago and a proposal was made that India might be made a member of the Political Conference that is the child of the armistice in Korea. India was put in a somewhat embarrassing position. We did not put our name forward and we did not want any additional burden. At the same time, we were strongly of opinion that this Political Conference should succeed, that there should be a settlement in the Far East of Asia, and that if we could help in that, we should not run away from it even if it meant a burden on us. Placed in this position, we did not push ourselves forward at all. But other countries, thinking that the presence of India there would be helpful, proposed our name. To the last, we made it clear that we could only function if the two major parties to this dispute wanted us to function. We were not interested in being pushed in by one party against the will of the other. And when I say 'the two major parties', I do not refer to any particular country, but to the United Nations on the one side, and the Chinese and the North Korean Commands on the other. These were the two parties to the armistice, and the Political Conference which flows from the armistice would also ultimately be concerned with these two parties as such. I repeat this because there has been some confusion about what we had said on this matter in the United Nations. This matter, as the House knows, came to a vote and in the voting there was a considerable majority in

From a speech in the House of the People (Lok Sabha),
September 17, 1953



*Prime Minister Nehru and Premier Bulganin
of the U.S.S.R. signing a joint declaration
at the Kremlin, Moscow, June 1955*


*With school children at Prague
Czechoslovakia, June 1955.*





Prime Minister Nehru and the visiting Soviet leaders, Mr. Bulganin and Mr. Khrushchev, with Uday Shankar's troupe after witnessing a shadow play presented by them at Raj Bhavan, Calcutta, November 1955


Addressing a public meeting at the Ram Lila Grounds, New Delhi, to commemorate the 2500th anniversary of the Buddha's Mahaparinirvana, May 1956. The President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, and the Vice-President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, are seated alongside.





*Unveiling a portrait of
Lokamanya Bal Ganga-
dhar Tilak, in the Central
Hall of Parliament House,
New Delhi, July 1956*

*Accepting flowers from an Indian boy during
visit to Saudi Arabia, September, 1956*





Releasing a pigeon at a children's rally held on his birthday, November 1956

favour of India and a big minority against it with a number of abstentions. But there was not the two-thirds majority that would have been necessary if it was to go to the plenary session. At that later stage we begged those who had put our names forward not to press it and so India was out of it.

But certain interesting consequences flow from this vote. If the voting is analysed, you will see that of the twenty-one countries who voted against India, eighteen were from the Americas, seventeen from what is called Latin America. Now, I have the greatest respect for the countries of Latin America. But the facts stand out that nearly the whole of Europe and nearly the whole of Asia wanted one thing in this Political Conference while a number of countries, all from the Americas, did not want it. They have as much right not to want it as the others have to want it. But the question that we have been considering is an Asian question. And is the will of Asia and of Europe to be flouted because some people who really are not intimately concerned with this question feel that way? That is an extraordinary position.

It is interesting because in spite of the major developments that have taken place in the world during the last few years, somehow it is not realized by many of the Great Powers of the world that the countries of Asia, however weak they might be, do not propose to be ignored, bypassed and sat upon. The whole of Asia has been in a state of ferment. Changes are taking place and they are revolutionary changes. Unless this fact is recognized by the rest of the world, one cannot get a correct appreciation of the world today.

The House knows that one of the issues before the United Nations for some time past has been whether the People's Government of China should be accepted there as a member or not. There has been some confusion of thought about this matter when people talk about China being admitted into the United Nations. There is no question of admitting China; China is one of the founder-members of the United Nations. The only question that can arise is who represents China. Can anyone say that the present Government of the island of Formosa represents China? Factually can any undertaking given by the Government of Formosa be carried out in

China? Obviously not. They cannot give an assurance on behalf of China. Therefore, it becomes completely unreal and artificial to talk about China being represented in the United Nations or in the Security Council by someone who cannot speak for China, who cannot do anything in China, who cannot affect China and who can at the utmost express strong disapproval of China. This is one of the basic criticisms which have been levelled against the politics of the United Nations.

How are this question and like questions to be considered? The other day I saw in the papers that it has been agreed amongst certain Great Powers that the question of China's inclusion should not be considered this year or in this session. I have no objection to doing things in a way which brings about the least conflict. But the kind of approach that I see is that an obviously wrong thing is perpetuated and a whole castle is sought to be built on an artificial foundation; and then, if something goes wrong afterwards, complaint is made. Politically these international blocs seem to be getting more and more removed from the realm of logic and reasoning, and I feel we are entering the bigoted sphere of religion. It is a dangerous attitude applied to politics. Religion may be all right when applied to ethics and morals, but if it enters the political sphere it has a minus effect on morals.

In regard to the Political Conference I understand that the People's Government of China in their reply to the United Nations proposals have made some counter-proposals. First of all, it should be remembered that all the parties agreed to a Political Conference being held in Korea to carry on the work of armistice and to try to settle the problems there. They were agreed on the functions of that Conference. The only question that is being considered or is in controversy is the composition of the Conference. It should be remembered also that a conference like that does not proceed by majority vote. It has more or less to decide issues—if not by unanimity—by consensus of opinion and agreement of the major parties concerned. It does not much matter, therefore, whether there are a few more on this side or that side, except that a larger crowd may create difficulty in getting down to business; otherwise, there is no particular difficulty.

The real question that arises is whether there should be neutral countries represented in this Conference. It has been our view that it would be helpful if such countries are represented, simply because they can sometimes help in toning down differences and easing a tense situation. The real agreement will naturally have to come between the others. The neutral is not going to bring about an agreement; he will only help in providing a certain atmosphere which might lead the others to agree. However, that is a matter for the United Nations and the other party to decide and we have absolutely no desire to be present in this Conference. We have undertaken a very heavy burden in Korea as it is. We are in this Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission and we have sent our troops there, and they have only begun their work. But from such information as we have received, they are having to face considerable difficulties. Somehow passions have been so roused among these prisoners that it is not particularly easy to deal with them. But hon. Members must have seen from reports in the press that the way our officers and men have handled this question has elicited praise from everybody there. I should like our representatives there in the Commission as well as the officers and men in the Armed Forces to feel that they have the goodwill and active sympathy of this House and the country.

I do not like to discuss in greater detail these matters which are before the United Nations, because that might well prove embarrassing to our own representatives there or to other countries. They are difficult questions. Some hon. Members have suggested, in a fit of frustration, that we should withdraw from the United Nations. That, if I may say so with all respect, is immaturity. One cannot run away like this from a problem. The United Nations, in spite of all its failings—and they are many—is a great world organization. It does contain within it the seeds of hope and peace, and it would be rather perverse for any country to try to destroy this structure because it is not to its entire liking. If a country does that, I have no doubt that it is that country which will suffer more than the organization. We cannot remain isolated in the world, cut off from everything and

living a life of our own in our limited sphere. Most of us in India are so situated as to be normally isolated in our minds, in our social habits like eating, drinking and marrying. We isolate ourselves in castes, with the result that it is a unique Indian habit which does not prevail anywhere else in the world. We live in compartments, and therefore, perhaps, we easily think in terms of isolation as a country too. But the fact is that isolation in the past has weakened us very greatly and left us rather in the lurch when the world has advanced in terms of science or other developments. We cannot be isolated; in fact, no country can be. Therefore, to talk of getting out of the United Nations or of otherwise keeping apart from all these problems is not to take cognizance of the realities of the situation.

MISSION IN KOREA

WHY DID we go to Korea? Was it to gain honour, glory and prestige? We went to Korea because, if we had not gone, there would have been no truce and no cease-fire and the war would have gone on, with a danger of its expansion. I cannot speak with a prophet's certainty of what would have happened if we had not gone there. But as we saw the problem at the time—and subsequent events have justified it—the only way first of all to get the United Nations to adopt that resolution and subsequently to see that there was agreement between the two Commands was for India to fill a gap which no other country could fill. I am not claiming any virtue for India. But it is a factual statement that no other country was willing to fill that particular gap. Without that gap being filled, there would have been no agreement. If there had been no agreement, then the cease-fire would not have taken place and the terrible war would have gone on. We had to face the problem with the utmost reluctance. We accepted the

From reply to Foreign Affairs debate, House of the People (Lok Sabha), December 24, 1953

job. And I would accept it not once but a hundred times again, because I owe a duty not only to my country but to others. I have been amazed for the last month or two to see people, not only in this House, saying and writing in the newspapers, that we should call back our troops immediately from Korea. When they say these things, they do not seem to consider the question with the least degree of responsibility. We are not a great military nation, nor a rich nation, but we have certain standards by which we act as a nation. Because somebody says something, because President Rhee says something that we do not like, can we call back our troops and upset the whole apple-cart, war or no war, massacre or no massacre? We are not going to do that as long as we are in charge of affairs. We are going to discharge the work to the best of our ability. Our ability may be limited, but in so far as we can do it, we shall discharge it with fairness and impartiality.

APPEAL FOR CEASE-FIRE IN INDO-CHINA

WHATEVER DIFFICULTIES might remain in Korea, at least the war has stopped. It is a very big achievement. Unfortunately, war has not stopped in Indo-China. It is being continued in a very terrible way. It has been six years now since this Indo-China war began. All of us here and many others, I have no doubt, would obviously welcome some kind of ending to this war, more especially when this matter is to be discussed two months from now by the Great Powers concerned. It seems a tremendous pity that this war should continue when a serious attempt is going to be made to find a way out. Certainly we have no desire to intervene in any way or intrude or involve ourselves. But I venture to suggest to all the parties and the Powers concerned that in view of the fact that this matter of Indo-China is going to be discussed at the Geneva Conference two months later, it might be

From reply to a debate on the President's Address, House of the People (Lok Sabha), February 22, 1954

desirable to have some kind of cease-fire. The parties need not give up their positions, whatever they might consider their rights. Once one starts arguing about rights, there will be no end. I would, therefore, make this very earnest appeal in all humility—and I am sure this House will join with me—to the Powers to strive to have a cease-fire in Indo-China. Then they can discuss it in their own way. I repeat that so far as we are concerned, we have no desire to interfere or to shoulder any burden or responsibility in this connection.

THE HYDROGEN BOMB

I WELCOME this opportunity to state the position of the Government and, I feel sure, of the country on the latest of all the dread weapons of war, the hydrogen bomb, and its known and unknown consequences and horrors.

The United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, we are told, possess this weapon and each of these countries has, during the last two years, effected test explosions unleashing impacts which in every respect were far beyond those of any weapons of destruction known to man.

A further and more powerful explosion than the one of 1st March has been effected by the United States and more are reported to have been scheduled to take place.

We know little more about the hydrogen bomb and its disastrous and horrible consequences than what has appeared in the press or is otherwise matter of general knowledge or speculation. But even what we do know, and the very fact that the full facts of the effects of these explosions do not appear to be known or to be ascertainable with any certainty even by scientists, point to certain conclusions. A new weapon of unprecedented power both in volume and intensity, with an unascertained, and probably unascertainable range of destructive potential in respect of time and space, that is, both

as regards duration and the extent of consequences, is being tested, unleashing its massive power, for use as a weapon of war. We know that its use threatens the existence of man and civilization as we know it. We are told that there is no effective protection against the hydrogen bomb and that millions of people may be exterminated by a single explosion and many more injured, and perhaps still many more condemned to slow death, or to live under the shadow of the fear of disease and death.

These are horrible prospects, and they affect us, nations and everyone, whether we are involved in wars or power blocs or not.

From diverse sides and parts of the world have come pronouncements which point to the dread features and ominous prospects of the hydrogen bomb era. I shall refer to but a few of them.

Some time ago, when the hydrogen bomb was first mentioned in public, Professor Albert Einstein said :

“The hydrogen bomb appears on the public horizon as a probable attainable goal.....If successful, radio-active poisoning of the atmosphere, and hence an annihilation of any life on earth, has been brought within the range of technical possibilities.”

That success appears now to have been achieved.

A U.S. professor, Dr. Greenhead of Cincinnati University, said :

“We are proceeding blindly in our atomic tests and sometimes we cannot predict the results of such blind moves.....The U.S. was able to make these bombs out of relatively plentiful substances. If these are used to create an explosive chain reaction, we are nearing the point where we suddenly have enough materials to destroy ourselves.

Mr. Martin, the Defence and Scientific Adviser to the Government of Australia, is reported to have said after the explosion of March 1 :

“For the first time I am getting worried about the hydrogen bombI can say as an individual that the hydrogen bomb has brought things to a stage where a conference between the four world Powers in mankind’s own interests can no longer be postponed.”

Mr. Lester Pearson, the External Affairs Minister of Canada, referred to the use of such weapons in war when he said recently that "a third World War accompanied by the possible devastation by new atomic and chemical weapons would destroy civilization".

The House will also recall the recent statement of Mr. Malenkov, the Soviet Prime Minister, on this subject, the exact words of which I have not before me, but which said in effect that modern war, with such weapons in use, would mean total destruction.

There can be little doubt about the deep and widespread concern in the world, particularly among peoples, about these weapons and their dreadful consequences. But concern is not enough. Fear and dread do not lead to constructive thought or effective courses of action. Panic is no remedy against disaster of any kind, present or potential.

Mankind has to awaken itself to the reality and face the situation with determination and assert itself to avert calamity.

The general position of this country in this matter has been repeatedly stated and placed beyond all doubt. It is up to us to pursue as best we can the objective we seek.

We have maintained that nuclear (including thermo-nuclear), chemical and biological (bacterial) knowledge and power should not be used to forge these weapons of mass destruction. We have advocated the prohibition of such weapons, by common consent, and immediately by agreement amongst those concerned, which latter is at present the only effective way to bring about their abandonment.

The House will no doubt recall the successive attempts made by us at the United Nations to secure the adoption of this view and approach.

At the last session of the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1953, as a result of amendments moved by our delegation to the Resolution on Disarmament, there were incorporated in the resolution that was adopted :

- (1) An "affirmation" by the General Assembly of its "earnest desire for the elimination and prohibition of atomic, hydrogen, bacterial, chemical and other weapons of war and mass

destruction and for the attainment of these ends through effective means."

- (2) A provision for setting up a sub-committee consisting of the Powers principally involved, to sit in private, and at places of its choosing to implement the purposes of the Disarmament Commission.

The House is aware that this latter suggestion has lately engaged the attention of the Powers principally concerned, at Berlin and elsewhere, and talks have taken place and, so far as we know, are continuing.

Time, however, appears to challenge us. Destruction threatens to catch up with us, if not to overtake us, on its march to its sinister goal. We must seek to arrest it and avert the dire end it threatens.

Government propose to continue to give the closest and continuous consideration to such steps as they can take in appropriate places and contexts in pursuit of our approach and the common objective.

I have stated publicly as our view that these experiments, which may have served their one and only useful purpose, namely, exposing the nature of the horror and tragedy, even though but partly, should cease. I repeat that to be our considered position, and it is our hope that this view and the great concern it reflects, and which is world-wide, will evoke adequate and timely responses.

Pending progress towards some solution, full or partial, in respect of the prohibition and elimination of these weapons of mass destruction, which the General Assembly has affirmed as its nearest desire, the Government would consider, among the steps to be taken now and forthwith, the following :

- (1) Some sort of what may be called "standstill agreement" in respect, at least, of these actual explosions, even if arrangements about the discontinuance of production and stockpiling must await more substantial agreements amongst those principally concerned.
- (2) Full publicity by those principally concerned in the production of these weapons, and by the United Nations, of the extent of the destructive power and the known effects of these weapons and also adequate indication of the unknown but

probable effects. Informed world public opinion is in our view the most effective factor in bringing about the results we desire.

- (3) Immediate (and continuing) private meetings of the sub-committees of the Disarmament Commission to consider the "standstill" proposal, which I have just mentioned, pending decisions on prohibitions, controls etc., to which the Disarmament Commission is asked by the General Assembly to address itself.
- (4) Active steps by states and people of the world who, though not directly concerned with the production of these weapons, are very much concerned with the possible use of them, and, also at present with these experiments and their effects. They would, I venture to hope, express their concern and add their voices and influence in as effective a manner as possible to arrest the progress of this destructive potential which menaces all alike.

The Government of India will use its best efforts in pursuit of these objectives.

I would conclude with an expression of the sympathy which this House and this country feel towards the victims of the recent explosions, Japanese fishermen and others, and to the people of Japan to whom it has brought much dread and concern by way of direct effects and by the fear of food contamination.

The open ocean appears no longer open, except in that those who sail on it for fishing or other legitimate purposes take the great and unknown risks caused by these explosions. It is of great concern to us that Asia and her peoples appear to be always nearer these occurrences and experiments, and their fearsome consequences, actual and potential.

We do not yet know fully whether the continuous effects of these explosions are carried only by the media of air and water or whether they subsist in other strata of nature and how long their effects persist, or whether they set up some sort of chain reactions at which some have already hinted.

We must endeavour with faith and hope to promote all efforts that seek to bring to a halt this drift to what appears to be the menace of total destruction.

THE COLOMBO POWERS' PEACE EFFORTS

I HAVE COME to Ceylon on many occasions previously, on work or just for the pleasure of a visit. But no previous visit of mine had the importance of the present one. I came here, as did the Prime Ministers of other South Asian countries, at the invitation of the Prime Minister of Ceylon, to confer on matters of common interest. Even during this short interval, since the invitation was given and accepted and our coming here, vital developments took place in the world, and more especially in Asia. An added significance was thus given to our Conference.

The mere fact of these five Prime Ministers of South Asia meeting together was a unique event of historic significance. Our meeting at this particular juncture, when the conflict in Indo-China is being considered, cast a special burden on us.

For five days we discussed these grave problems. It was not enough for us merely to express an opinion or pass resolutions. The new turn in history is casting new responsibilities upon the countries of Asia and, therefore, whatever we may say or do must take into consideration this responsibility from which we cannot escape. Freedom has come to us, but the other counterpart of freedom is responsibility and obligation.

Inevitably, we represented viewpoints which occasionally differed. But the fact to be remembered is that, by and large, we had a common outlook on these grave problems, even though that common outlook might be tempered by the peculiar problems that each country has to face.

Thus, we made a beginning and I think it was a good beginning, full of promise for the future. Even in the present, we have given, in language of moderation, clear expression to the way we look at world problems as well as our national problems. Our dominant passion and urgent necessity is for the maintenance of peace, because without that all our plans and our visions for the future are likely to be shattered to bits. Indeed, unless peace is preserved, the world itself will be shattered.

The question of Indo-China, inevitably, was dominant in our thoughts. Some time ago, I ventured to put forward some suggestions on behalf of the Government of India in regard to the conflict in Indo-China. The Prime Ministers' Conference here has accepted that general approach and recommended certain steps in line with it which, if acted upon, I am sure, will take us towards a solution in Indo-China. The problem is difficult. It has grown progressively more difficult as time has passed without solving it; and if we fail again to take advantage of this present opportunity, then, indeed, it is likely to grow much worse. Therefore, we must not fail, as the consequences of failure are likely to be widespread and terrible.

The first thing is to limit this conflict and to have a cease-fire. Indeed, a solution is not likely unless there is this limiting and unless the main burden of a solution is cast on the belligerent countries. In such cases, outside interference adds to the complexity of the problem and to the dangers inherent in it. The Prime Ministers have suggested, therefore, that the principal countries concerned, apart from the belligerents, should come to an understanding to prevent a resumption of conflict after the cease-fire. An essential condition for this would be that other countries should not supply aid to the belligerents. The main difficulty we have had to face thus far has been the pouring in of military aid on either side by other countries.

Whether in Indo-China or elsewhere, peace can only come if we endeavour to establish a climate of peace. It is not by condemnation or mutual recrimination that we shall achieve this goal. We must forget past conflicts and past grievances and decide to make a new approach to each other in a spirit of tolerance and forbearance with charity towards all and malice to none.

The Prime Ministers' Conference has laid stress on the democratic character of our countries and our desire to maintain this structure of democracy, in which we believe. It has issued a warning against all kinds of external interference from any quarter whatsoever. We are jealous of our freedom and while we wish to co-operate with all the countries of the

world and live in friendship with them, attempts at interference must produce resentment and conflict and come in the way of the friendly relations that we desire. Indeed, in this world of ours, with its great variety and often differing objectives and ideologies, the only way for peaceful co-existence is for interference by one country in another to cease and for each country to have the freedom to develop itself according to its own genius and the wishes of its people. It is for this reason, among others, that we are entirely opposed to colonialism and the domination of any one country by another.

The Conference has finished its labours; and yet this was just the beginning of its work and the burden now falls on those who participated in it to continue that work and not to be afraid of shouldering any responsibility that might flow from it.

A few days ago, an agreement between India and China was signed in Peking. Although this agreement refers specifically to matters relating to Tibet, it has a larger significance as the preamble to it lays down. The agreement is based on the principles of mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty, mutual non-aggression, mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence. The political and economic structures of India and China, as is well known, differ. Nevertheless, we have arrived at this agreement, basing it on these principles. If these principles were recognized in the mutual relations of all countries, then indeed there would hardly be any conflict and certainly no war. This agreement not only settles some outstanding points between the great countries of India and China and establishes their relationship firmly on a peaceful basis, but I think it will help in the maintenance of peace in Asia. It is from this larger point of view, more especially, that I have welcomed this agreement and I would like you also to consider it in this wider context.

I am going back to Delhi after five fruitful days in Ceylon. I carry back memories of the gracious hospitality and friendship which the Government and the people of Ceylon have showered upon us. May it be well with this beautiful island and her people in the future !

CONTROL OF NUCLEAR ENERGY

HON. MEMBERS on both sides of the House have talked about banning nuclear weapons. But it is not quite clear to me how our sentiments or a strong speech in this House will lead to such a ban. There is no doubt that these weapons will ultimately have to be controlled, if not put an end to. But, from what we know of this world, who is to bell the cat? It might have been possible if there had been no conflict between the colossi in this respect. Neither of them is going to control the nuclear bomb till he is certain that the other will control it. Each will sit back and say to himself that despite some public protestation, there will really be no attempt to control the weapons. Yet it is necessary to control them. The question remains how to do it. International law, as is well known, is too feeble an instrument yet to achieve it.

In the last generation or two, there have been certain explorations of the remotest frontiers of human knowledge which are leading us to many strange discoveries and strange consequences. Max Planck's Quantum Theory and, later on, Albert Einstein's Theory of Relativity changed the whole conception of the universe. Soon came the atom bomb with its power to kill. The human mind and human efforts are unleashing tremendous powers without quite knowing how to control them. They cannot be controlled by a mere desire or demand for banning them. Nobody can really control the human mind from going on unleashing new forces. One of the political problems of the day is how to approach this problem of control which is of vital consequence. Such an approach presupposes some measure of lessening of tension in the world, some measure of mutual confidence on the part of the great nations, some agreement to allow each country to live its own life. The only alternative is conflict, and if the idea of conflict is in the minds of nations, then the atom bomb will undoubtedly remain.

Let us consider the possible issues. It is perfectly clear that atomic energy can be used for peaceful purposes, to the

immense advantage of humanity. It may take some years before it can be used more or less economically. I should like the House to remember that the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes is far more important for a country like India whose power resources are limited, than for a country like France, an industrially advanced country. Take the United States of America, which already has vast power resources of other kinds. To have an additional source of power like atomic energy does not mean very much for them. No doubt they can use it; but it is not so indispensable for them as for a power-starved or power-hungry country like India or like most of the other countries in Asia and Africa. I say that because it may be to the advantage of countries which have adequate power resources to restrain and restrict the use of atomic energy because they do not need that power. It would be to the disadvantage of a country like India if that is restricted or stopped. We should remember this very important aspect of the so-called international control. Who is to control atomic energy internationally? Which are the nations that are going to control it? One may say, the United Nations. Obviously, there is no other organization approaching the United Nations in its international jurisdiction. And yet, the House knows, the United Nations as it is does not include in its scope even the big nations of the world. Some of the biggest are kept out. The United Nations can control only itself. It cannot control any nation which is not in it, which it refuses to admit and with which it would not have anything to do. The result will be that though it may control a great part of the world, still there is a part of the world which is not controlled by it. That part over which there is no control, may make all the mischief. Therefore, the question of international control becomes difficult. Reference has been made to international control in President Eisenhower's speech. We all agree with the proposition that there should be proper international control and proper use made of the stock of fissile materials, so that all countries can use them for research work or for proper purposes. But how is this to be done? That is where the difficulty comes in. President Eisenhower refers to some agency of the United Nations. That

appears reasonable, but let us see what actual proposals have been made in regard to atomic energy control by various countries. At the beginning of the year, the United States said : "An international control agency shall be set up by the United Nations. It shall thereafter be an independent body outside the control of the Security Council and of the United Nations." The United Nations is merely supposed to set up the agency and wash its hands of it. It becomes an independent organization. This organization will, of course, have an unlimited right of inspection. Agreed. "It shall have the right to maintain its own guards on the territory of any foreign State, licensed to engage in any of the processes of the production of or research in atomic energy." Thus the atomic energy body becomes a super-State, maintaining its own guards or armies or whatever you like to call them. Then again, "it shall own and control"—mark these words—"the raw materials mined, the plants in which the ore is processed, and all plants which deal with production of atomic energy wherever they may be situated in any country of the world." This is a very far-reaching provision. It means that all our raw materials and our mines would be owned and controlled by that independent body, which is even independent of the United Nations after it is created. It means tremendous power being concentrated in the hands of a select body. "It shall decide if, when and where and to what extent the various processes may be carried out and in which parts of the world atomic energy plants may be established"—and there are limitations also—"and it shall have authority to issue or withhold licences from countries, institutions or enterprises engaged in any activities relating to the production of atomic energy."

I read to you some of the proposals. This vast power is proposed to be given to a body which is independent even of the United Nations which sponsors it or starts it. An important consideration is who will be in it. Either you make the body as big as the United Nations with all the countries represented, or it will be some relatively small body, inevitably with the Great Powers sitting in it and lording it over. I say with all respect to them that they will have a grip

over all the atomic energy areas and raw materials in every country. Now, for a country like India, is it a desirable prospect?

When hon. Members talk so much of international control, let us understand, without using vague phrases and language, what it means. There should be international control and inspection, but it is not such an easy matter as it seems. Certainly, we would be entitled to object to any kind of control which is not exercised to our advantage. We are prepared in this, as in any other matter, even to limit, in common with other countries, our independence of action for the common good of the world. We are prepared to do that, provided we are assured that it is for the common good of the world and not exercised in a partial way, and not dominated over by certain countries, however good their motives.

In President Eisenhower's speech these details are not gone into, but he says that what he calls "normal uranium" should be controlled. I could have understood control of fissile materials. But President Eisenhower refers to "normal uranium." By "normal uranium" he presumably means uranium ores. Again we get back to the raw materials. I submit it would not be right to agree to any plan which hands over even our raw materials and mines to any external authority. I would again beg the House to remember the major fact that atomic energy for peaceful purposes is far more important to the under-developed countries of the world than to the developed ones. And if the developed countries have all the powers, they may well stop the use of atomic energy everywhere, including in their own countries, because they do not need it so much, and in consequence we might suffer.

We welcome the approach of President Eisenhower in this matter. Since he delivered his speech this question has been discussed by representatives of other Great Powers chiefly concerned, and if they find out any suitable method for creating this international pool, we shall be very happy, and, subject to what I have said, we shall give what we can to it.

Dr. Saha drew a rather dismal picture of our pitiable state in this matter. He referred to our coal supplies running out.

Now, my own information, derived from our best geologists, is contrary to what Dr. Saha said. I believe there is a dispute between Dr. Saha and our geologists, but with all my respect for him, I would take our geologists' word in this matter. Dr. Saha is an eminent physicist, but our geologists are expected to know more about coal than Dr. Saha.

Here I may say what our geologists' estimate of our coal reserve is :

Total reserves of coal in the Indian rock formations, down to a depth of 2,000 feet	60,000 million tons
Total reserves of available coal, of all grades, which are considered workable by present methods	20,000 million tons
Reserves of first grade coal, workable	5,000 million tons
Reserves of coking coal suitable for metallurgical use	1,750 to 2,000 million tons
Present-day annual consumption of coal in India, of all grades	35 million tons
Annual consumption of metallurgical grade coal (coking coal used both for metallurgical and non-metallurgical purposes)	About 8 to 12 million tons
Consumption of coking coal purely for metallurgical purposes	About 3 million tons

As is well known we are wasting our best coal by using it in our railways, where it is not necessary. Attempts are being made in our railways not to use our best coal. Consumption of coking coal purely for metallurgical purposes is about 3 million tons, while our annual consumption of metallurgical grade coal both for metallurgical and non-metallurgical purposes is about 8 to 12 million tons. This is chiefly because our railways and some of our factories use this high-grade coal, for the reason that it is easily available. We should curb this, because our best coal should not be wasted in this way while other coal is available.

Recent experiments conducted in India by the Fuel Research Institute and private industrial concerns, like Tatas, go to show that our second-grade coal is capable of improvement to first grade by coal-washing and blending methods. Large-scale trials for (I regret I do not wholly understand the meaning of the word which I am going to read) "beneficiation" of low-grade coal give promise that India's coal resources will prove adequate for all her present as well as future needs.

According to the above summary, assuming that correct methods of mining are employed and waste is eliminated, we have reserves of 2,000 million tons of high-grade and coking coal which should last (if the consumption were restricted to use in iron and steel and other metal manufacturing industries alone) for a period of about 650 years. But India is using coking coal today for ordinary furnace and railway purposes, for domestic fuel, and some industrial uses to the extent of about ten to twelve million tons per annum. At this rate the life of coking coal reserves will be reduced to 160 years only.

The position, however, is different in respect of non-coking coal of good and medium quality, the supply of which is such as would last for several hundred years, allowing the present rate of consumption plus a progressively increasing rate for future industrial expansion. Of course, India's resources in coal are much less than those of the United States or the U.S.S.R.

SHRI MEGHNAD SAHA : May I interrupt? If our industrial power is increased ten times, its lifetime would be 650 divided by 10 which is 65 years. It is a very dismal prospect.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : The hon. Member is thinking of metallurgical coal. The other coal, even if the industrial capacity is increased very greatly, is enough to last for several hundred years.

Dr. Saha put a question, directly or indirectly, as to whether we have the necessary scientific personnel of requisite competence to set up a nuclear reactor. He mentioned that we had stated five years ago that it would be set up. He is

perfectly justified in pointing out that it has not been set up. It is true there has been delay. It was delayed owing to certain factors outside our control. We are setting it up. We have obviously to get some equipment from abroad. We have to get heavy water which we do not produce yet. It was difficult to get this heavy water but I believe things are in good shape about the starting of this moderate-sized reactor.

As for our scientific personnel, we cannot compare ourselves with the great countries, but leaving out some of the big countries, we are supposed to be rather good in our scientific personnel even now. We can put up a reactor even if fissile materials are not available from the common pool proposed by President Eisenhower. It is not that we are entirely depending upon some common pool. Even if some help may not be forthcoming, even if the fissile materials and the moderators do not become readily available, I think we can do it. We have sent several teams abroad and people are being trained both in India and abroad for this purpose. I think we are justified in assuming that this would produce results very soon.

The Atomic Energy Commission has also a small team which is gaining experience in the use of radio-active isotopes which will become available when the reactor starts functioning, for biological and other research and for medical treatment.

The main purpose in putting up the reactor is to acquire the necessary technical experience which will help us later on to put up power plants for peaceful purposes. Therefore, some of the workers are engaged in gaining experience in some of the technical processes like heat transfer which will be needed at the later stages. The reactor will also help us to produce some types of radio-active isotopes. At present radio-active isotopes are used in biological research for study of metabolism of various elements. For medical treatment radio-active isotopes, specially radio-active iodine, are used. These are much weaker in intensity of radiation and can be easily controlled. But they have a short life. Radio-active isotopes are also used for metallurgical studies. All of these can be purchased from abroad even now for peaceful purposes,

but some are so short-lived that even in the course of transit they lose some activity. It is obviously more advantageous to produce them here. We have got, of course, a major Division dealing with prospecting of ores and raw materials. Two new Divisions have been started, a Medical and Health Division which deals with the protection of workers against the effects of radiation and with research and associated problems, and a Biology Division which conducts investigations on the biological effects of radiation.

Hon. Members have referred to our sending some part of the monazite sands abroad. Some five or six years ago they were sent abroad without limit; anybody could come and take shiploads of them. We stopped that. I believe even now there is some theft going on occasionally from the coast. We try to stop that by posting guards and in other ways. But we have not considered the question of monazite as a money-making proposition, although it is a money-making commodity. We give it in exchange for something that we lack for atomic energy development. We are in contact with the Atomic Energy Commissions of France and England. We help each other. We have, therefore, supplied monazite to them. We have occasionally supplied some to the United States of America and some other countries too. I do not have the figures, but, generally speaking, what we have supplied is relatively small in quantity. As a matter of fact we do not as far as possible want to export these sands. We now supply the processed material. We have put up a factory in Travancore-Cochin for processing the material, and it is much more advantageous for us to supply the processed material than the sands. We are also putting up a factory at Trombay near Bombay. A good deal of work is being done in these matters.

Dr. Meghnad Saha said that there should be no secrecy. I entirely agree with him. Our difficulty has been that when we deal with another country, whether it is France or England, and when they give us any process or any information, they insist on secrecy for their part and we have to agree because it is their custom. We have to take some things from them; we cannot get them otherwise; we have to give that

assurance and keep it. Otherwise, there is no secrecy so far as we are concerned. It is obvious that in this matter of atomic energy work, we are in the first stages and not so advanced as the Soviet Union or America or England. We have really nothing to hide.

AGREEMENT ON TIBET

A VERY IMPORTANT event to which I would like to draw the attention of the House is the agreement between India and China in regard to Tibet. That agreement deals with a large number of problems, each one of them not very important in itself perhaps, but important from the point of view of our trade, our pilgrim traffic, our trade posts, our communications there, and the rest. It took a considerable time to arrive at this agreement, not because of any major conflict or difficulty but because the number of small points were so many and had to be discussed in detail. The major thing about this agreement to which I would like again to draw the attention of the House is the preamble to the agreement. It states :

The principles and considerations which govern our mutual relations and the approach of the two countries to each other are as follows :

- (i) Mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty;
- (ii) Mutual non-aggression;
- (iii) Mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs;
- (iv) Equality and mutual benefit; and
- (v) Peaceful coexistence.

These principles indicate the policy that we pursue in regard to these matters not only with China but with any neighbour country, or for that matter any other country. What is more, it is a statement of wholesome principles, and I imagine that if these principles were adopted in the

From speech during Foreign Affairs debate, Lok Sabha, May 15, 1954

relations of various countries with one another, a great deal of the trouble of the present-day world would probably disappear.

It is a matter of importance to us, of course, as well as, I am sure, to China that these countries, which have now almost about 1,800 miles of frontier, should live in terms of peace and friendliness and should respect each other's sovereignty and integrity, should agree not to interfere with each other in any way, and not to commit aggression on each other. By this agreement, we ensure peace to a very large extent in a certain area of Asia. I would earnestly wish that this area of peace could be spread over the rest of Asia and indeed over the rest of the world.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS have referred to 'the melancholy chapter of Tibet'. I really do not understand. I have given the most earnest thought to this matter. What did any hon. Member of this House expect us to do in regard to Tibet at any time? Did we fail, or did we do a wrong thing? I would beg any hon. Member who has doubts about this question just to find out the background, the early history and the late history of Tibet and India and China, and the history of the British in Tibet. Where did we come into the picture unless we wanted to assume an aggressive role of interfering with other countries? Many things happen in the world which we do not like and which we would wish were rather different but we do not go like Don Quixote with lance in hand against everything that we dislike; we put up with these things because we would be, without making any difference, merely getting into trouble.

Big changes have taken place in the world since the last War. Among them has been the rise of a united China. Forget for a moment the broad policies it pursues—communist or near-communist or whatever it may be. The fact is, and it is a major fact of the middle of the 20th century, that China has become a great Power—united and strong.

From speech in Lok Sabha during debate on Foreign Affairs, September 30, 1954

By that I do not imply that because China is a great Power, India must be afraid of China or submit to China or draw up its policies in deference to China. Not at all. The fact of the matter is, with all respect to all countries of the world, the two great Powers striding across the world are the United States of America and the Soviet Union. Now China has come into the picture with enormous potential strength, though not much actual strength. Remember, China is still far less industrially developed than even India is. Much is being done in China which is praiseworthy and we can learn from them and we hope to learn from them, but let us look at things in proper perspective. India is industrially more developed than China. India has far more communications, transport and so on. China, no doubt, will go ahead fast; I am not comparing or criticizing, but what I said was that this enormous country of China, which is a great Power and which is powerful today, is potentially still more powerful. Leaving these three big countries, the United States of America, the Soviet Union and China, aside for the moment, look at the world. There are much advanced, highly cultured countries. But if you peep into the future and if nothing goes wrong—wars and the like—the obvious fourth country in the world is India.

I am not speaking with any vainglory but merely analysing the situation. Given economic growth, given unity, given other factors, India, by virtue of her general talent, working capacity, geographical situation and all that, will rise. Countries like China and India, once they get rid of foreign domination and internal disunity, inevitably become strong; there is nothing to stop them. They have the ability and the capacity. The only things that weaken them are internal disunity and any kind of external domination.

Ultimately, if the people have it in them, they go ahead. Even if governments are stupid, they go ahead. These great countries, after some hundreds of years of being submerged, are coming up. You have to realize that. Do not get mixed up and tied up with the rather superficial arguments, important as they might be, of communism and anti-communism. They somehow confuse the issue. It is far better to forget these for

the moment in order to analyse the world situation. But the misfortune has been that in Western countries, or in some of them, they are so obsessed with communism and anti-communism that they completely fail to see the forces at work in the world. We are not obsessed with that thought. Some countries get irritated with us for not seeing the light as they see it. But we think of ourselves, we think of our own good, we think of how we should progress.

THE SOUTH-EAST ASIA TREATY ORGANIZATION

THE GENEVA TALKS ended in an agreement and the war that had been going on for seven and a half years in Indo-China came to a stop. For the first time in many years there was no national war in the world. A new atmosphere of concord and of relative peace was established in Indo-China. In Asia, tensions relaxed. But nobody was foolish enough to think that problems had been solved. No problem had, in fact, been solved either in Indo-China or in Korea or elsewhere, but certain steps had been taken towards creating an atmosphere which would help in the solution of the problems. Even that was something, and the whole world, I believe, heaved a deep sigh of relief that at last we were going towards some kind of peace.

Another conference has been held recently in Manila in the Philippines. We had been invited to that conference, but we expressed our inability to attend or participate in it in any way. Normally it is our desire to participate in conferences, particularly of countries which are our neighbours, in order to understand their viewpoints and to put forward our own. Why did we not participate in the Manila conference? Apart from every other reason, big or small, it is obvious that our participation in the Manila conference would have meant our giving up our basic policy of non-alignment. We were not

going to give up that basic policy, which we have followed for so many years, merely to participate in that conference.

Secondly, our going there would obviously have affected our position as Chairman of the three Commissions in Indo-China. We were chosen for these responsible posts because we were thought to follow a certain policy. If we had changed that policy and gone back upon it, our whole position in Indo-China would have changed. That would have been a very improper thing to do.

I have often wondered what was the special urge or the special drive towards having this Manila conference and the South-East Asia Treaty that emerged from it. What was the sudden fear that brought these countries together? Was any aggression going to take place? Was the peace of South-East Asia or the Pacific threatened suddenly? Why was that particular time chosen, just after the Geneva Treaty? I have been unable to find the answer. I can understand, for example, the French fears and their trying to balance them. I can understand fears in the Asian countries round-about, in Australia and in New Zealand. It is no good denying the fact. But how do we meet these fears, and how do we counteract them and deal with the situation in a manner which will create more security?

I put it to the House to consider whether this Manila Treaty has relaxed tensions in South-East Asia or increased them. Has it taken South-East Asia or any other part of the world more towards peace and security or has it not? Has it created any bulwark for peace and security? I confess I see neither any lessening of tension nor any advance towards peace. The reverse is the truth. The Treaty itself, as a matter of fact, does not go very far. Those who were previously of a certain viewpoint have, I presume, expressed their opinion in a more corporate way. The Manila Treaty does not add to their strength. Positively, therefore, it has little contribution to make. Negatively, it has definitely added to the tensions and fears of the situation.

It would be unrealistic for me to suggest that any country in South-East Asia or India should live in a sense of false security or tell themselves, "Let us sing the song of peace,

and nothing will happen." I realize that responsible governments and countries cannot behave in that manner. They have to take precautions against any eventuality. But they should also, I suggest, fashion their policy in such a manner that they will go in the direction of peace.

There is another curious aspect of this SEATO or SEADO—whatever it is called. I can understand a number of countries coming together for their own defence and making an alliance. This particular Treaty, although not very strong so far as the military aspect is concerned, goes somewhat beyond those very countries. There is constant reference in the Treaty to its defensive area. This area does not comprise merely the territory of the countries which are parties to that Treaty but goes beyond it. This area can be designated by those countries by merely declaring that any given place is also in their area. This, I submit, is a dangerous extension of this idea of defence. I am not for the moment challenging or criticizing the motives of the countries which are parties to the Manila Treaty. I do not know what their motives are. I presume they want a measure of security, and I do not challenge that desire. But I do submit that they have set about it in the wrong way. The area which they have mentioned is partly determinate and partly indeterminate, because the countries concerned can expand that area, if they so agree unanimously, by saying, "This is also in our area." If anything happens in that area—that is, even outside the territories of the Treaty Powers concerned—they can take such steps as they feel like taking.

Hon. Members may remember the old days when the Great Powers had spheres of influence in Asia and elsewhere. The countries of Asia were then too weak to do anything about it. The quarrel was between the Big Powers and they sometimes came to an agreement about dividing the countries in spheres of influence. It seems to me that this particular Manila Treaty is inclined dangerously in the direction of spheres of influence to be exercised by powerful countries. After all, it is the big and powerful countries that will decide matters and not the two or three weak and small Asian countries that may be allied to them.

Another fact to which I should like to draw Members' attention is the reference made in this Treaty to aggression. One can understand mention of external aggression in a defence treaty, but there is reference also to 'a fact or situation created within this area' which might entitle them to intervene. Observe these words. They do not refer to external invasion. It means that any internal development in that area might also entitle these countries to intervene. Does this not affect the whole conception of integrity, sovereignty and independence of the countries of this area? A great part of this SEATO Treaty reads well. There are phrases about the United Nations Charter, about these countries' desire for peace, about their desire even to encourage self-government in colonial territories provided they are ready and competent to shoulder this heavy burden. All this reads well. But after reading the Treaty carefully, I feel that its whole approach is wrong and dangerous from the point of view of any Asian country. I repeat that I realize that the motives may be quite good. Countries in Asia as well as outside may have certain justifiable fears. But, I say, the approach of this Treaty is wrong and may antagonize a great part of Asia. Are you going to have peace and security by creating more conflicts and antagonisms and by making people think that instead of bringing security you bring insecurity into that region?

We in India have ventured to talk about an area of peace. We have thought that one of the major areas of peace might be South-East Asia. The Manila Treaty rather comes in the way of that area of peace. It takes up that very area which might be an area of peace and converts it almost into an area of potential war. I find this development disturbing.

A North Atlantic Treaty Organization was created some years ago. When it first saw the light of day it was a defence organization of certain countries associated in joint defence. I must say that at that time it seemed to me nothing but a justifiable reaction for certain countries who were afraid of certain developments to join together in defence. But observe how this NATO developed. In the first place it developed geographically. Supposed to be the North Atlantic community, it spread to the Mediterranean, to the coasts of Africa,

to Eastern Africa and to distant countries which had nothing to do with the Atlantic community. Internally too it began to extend itself. The various resolutions of the NATO Powers, meeting from time to time, gradually extended the organization's scope. When the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was first envisaged, it was for defence. But gradually we found that it was supposed to cover the colonial possessions of all those Powers also. How the maintenance and continuation of the authority of those colonial Powers over their dependent countries is a matter of defence of the North Atlantic community is not quite clear to me. However, that idea has extended itself and become a North Atlantic Treaty giving a protecting cover to the colonial domains of the Powers concerned.

This House will remember that recently a reference has been made by the Portuguese authorities to the North Atlantic Treaty covering Goa too in its wide scope. We are not bound down by any treaties to which we are not parties. We have stated it plainly. I am not quite sure if the North Atlantic Powers, or most of them, are themselves quite happy about this assertion by the Portuguese Government that Goa is also the NATO countries' concern. What I wish to point out is how these treaties, meant for a particular purpose, might gradually begin to extend their scope and nature and ultimately become something much bigger and wider than what people imagined them to be. If the North Atlantic Treaty has managed to extend its scope to Goa, I wonder whether the South-East Asia Treaty too will extend likewise. It starts at our door-step; where might it not go?

In the South-East Asia Treaty there are certain colonial Powers, certain Powers not colonial in themselves but interested in colonialism, and certain associated countries, all of which try to decide or control the fate of this great area of South-East Asia. I think the world is too small now for any few countries, including the Asian countries, to say that nobody else can interfere with an area and that that area is their sole concern. What happens in South-East Asia is also the concern of the rest of the world, not only of South-East Asia, but I submit that when decisions of vital significance are

made for an area excluding the views of the vital part of that very area, then there is something wrong in the procedure. I have said this about the South-East Asia Treaty Organization because we feel strongly about it. By itself the Treaty may not have carried events very far but we feel that it is going along a dangerous direction. This may not be obvious at the present moment to everybody but I have no doubt that, unless something is done about it, it will become more and more harmful to the interests of peace in South-East Asia and the world at large.

In regard to the United Nations, this House knows that we have stood for the People's Government of China being represented there. Recently the United Nations has passed a resolution that this matter will not be considered for a year or so. I have long been convinced of the fact that a great part of our present-day difficulties—certainly in the Far East, but I would like to go farther and say in the world—is due to this extraordinary shutting of one's eyes to the fact of China. It is totally immaterial whether you like China or dislike it. Here is a great country, and the United Nations, or some countries of the United Nations, refuse to recognize it. There are all kinds of conflicts as a result. I am convinced that there would have been no Korean War if the People's Government of China had been in the United Nations, because people could have dealt with China across the table. This non-recognition has thus added to the complexities and difficulties of the world's problems.

Remember that it is not a question of the admission of China to the United Nations. China is one of the founder-members of the United Nations. It is merely a question of who represents China. This fact is not adequately realized. It is not a question really for the Security Council or anybody else to decide. The Security Council has to decide when new countries come in. China is not a new country. It is a founder-member of the United Nations. It is really a question of credentials as to who represents China. It is a straightforward question. And it amazes me how this straightforward question has been twisted around and made the cause of infinite troubles. There would be no settlement in the Far East

or South-East Asia till this major fact of the People's Government of China is recognized. I say one of the biggest factors towards ensuring security in South-East Asia and in the Far East is the recognition of China by these countries and China coming into the United Nations. There would be far greater assurance of security that way than through this South-East Asia Treaty Organization and the rest.

If China comes in, apart from the fact that you deal with China face to face in the United Nations and elsewhere, China assumes certain responsibilities in the United Nations. The position today is very odd. Sometimes the United Nations passes resolutions giving certain directions to the People's Government of China. The response from China is: "You do not recognize us; we are not in the United Nations; how can we recognize your directions?" This is an understandable response. Instead of adding to the responsibility and laying down ways of co-operation, you thus shut the door of co-operation and add to the irresponsible behaviour of nations in this way, and call it security. The result inevitably is that the influence of the United Nations lessens. I do not want it to lessen, because it is one of our biggest hopes of peace in the world.

May I refer to one other matter? One of the reasons why the Asian countries, particularly the countries of South-East Asia, fear this great country, China, has been the large Chinese populations in these countries. In some countries, like Malaya, a very difficult problem arises. I believe all of us here are in favour of Malayan independence. But remember that the problem in Malaya is not an easy one. It is difficult because, oddly enough, in Malaya the people of Malaya are in a minority. The Chinese are there in great numbers; the Indians may be 10 or 15 per cent. No single group is in a majority. The indigenous people of Malaya are not at all keen on something happening which might give power to non-Malayans there. I am pointing out the difficulties which we have to understand. Malaya, Burma, Indonesia, Indo-China and Thailand have large Chinese communities. This fact rather frightens them. In the old days and until now the Government of China did not recognize the right of any Chinese person to divest himself of Chinese nationality. A

very peculiar situation was created as a result. On occasions there was some kind of dual nationality. That also was a factor in making the position of the Chinese communities in all these South-Asian countries very embarrassing to those countries. When the foreigners in a country are almost fifty per cent, it creates difficulties.

An interesting development is taking place, and reference has been made to it recently both by the Prime Minister of China, Mr. Chou En-lai, and the Chairman of the Republic, Chairman Mao Tse-tung. They say that Chinese communities living outside will have to make a choice as regards their allegiance. These communities will have to choose either to become nationals of the country they are living in, or to retain Chinese nationality. In the latter event, they must not interfere in the internal affairs of the other country. That, I think, is a helpful move, which will remove some of the difficulties and apprehensions in these South-East Asian countries.

Frankly, most of these countries are afraid not of what governments do officially, but what they might do *sub rosa* through the activities of the communist parties in these countries. The fact of the matter is that one of the serious difficulties that have arisen in international affairs is the growth of what might be called international groups which are tied up with an outside nation. Previously one country was against another, and you knew where you were. There might be a handful of people in your country who might sympathize with the other country. But now we have these international groups who oppose the national group and who, psychologically, emotionally and intellectually, are tied up with another nation's national group. This is one of the essential difficulties of the situation. I am not discussing communism, its theory and practice. I am merely pointing out the essential difficulty of these countries. If there was such a thing as a national communist party in a country, that is, a party which had nothing to do with another country, that would be a different matter. It would be one of various parties, with a definite political and economic policy. But the difficulty comes in because that party in a country is, as I said, intellectually, mentally and otherwise tied up with other groups in other

countries. Those other countries might well utilize such a party for their own advantage. That is the fear that Burma and Thailand and other South-East Asian countries have. In the old days there was the Comintern, that international communist organization which was wound up some time during the last war. Later came the Cominform which was, I suppose, something of the old type in a different garb. I think that similarly these organizations and the activities that flow from that area have caused a good deal of apprehension and disturbance in various countries and nations. And now, as a reaction, we have other forms of international interference in national affairs growing up in various countries, not in the ideological way, but in a practical, governmental, *sub rosa* way. This kind of thing is thus growing on every side, not one side only.

If you want peace in the world, you have to come to grips with this problem. It cannot be done by threats, or by having these military alliances. Once you recognize, as I believe it is recognized the world over, that war is no solution, and that the two major protagonists are too powerful to be dismissed one by the other, then you have to coexist, you have to understand, you have to be restrained and you have to deal with each other. If you reject coexistence, the alternative is war and mutual destruction.

THE NEW CHINA

I AM ASKED QUESTIONS about China as if I had gone to some unknown land about which nobody knew anything, or somewhere in the heart of Africa where *nobody had gone* previously. I happen to be rather well acquainted with China's history of the past few thousand years, and I have even written something about not only Chinese history but the history of other Asian countries. I have happened to follow

very closely what has happened in China during the last thirty or forty years, just as I have attempted to follow what has happened in other countries of Asia and outside. So I did not go to China with a blank mind.

I go there, I spend a few days. Naturally it makes all the difference in the world to see a thing for yourself rather than read about it or hear about it. Nevertheless, there is nothing that I saw in China which, if I may say so, surprised me. I had many vivid impressions, but I found things as I had expected to find them. I would like you, gentlemen, to keep this in mind. First, that I did not go either to preach or to be preached to, either to give guarantees or to demand them, but rather to understand, to be impressed and to impress, in a friendly way.

May I strike a certain personal note, and then go on to other considerations? We, of my generation in India, have been conditioned in particular ways by events. There is the background of two thousand years or more. There is the conditioning we have had during the 150 or 200 years of British rule. And then there is the big conditioning, during the last 30 or 35 years, of what is called the Gandhian movement. We are the resultants of these various conditioning factors. If you want to understand us, you have to understand these conditioning factors. If that is so about me and my generation in India, that applies to the world at large also. We have to understand other people's basic conditioning factors, their past history, traditions, habits, conflicts, etc., and more particularly the recent history of the last half a century or so. Countries like India and China have millennia of history. It is not an easy matter for me, whatever new knowledge I may gather, to get out of the 2,000 years of Indian history. So also with other countries. Yet, in order to understand another country it is no good looking at it through the spectacles of our own country. If an Indian presumes, with his Indian background, to judge England or Germany or Russia, he will probably not be objective enough.

Now, take China. Leaving out past history, it has been conditioned for more than forty years—ever since the end of the Manchu Dynasty—by continuous trouble. That was

China's experience. Take the background of the present rulers of China. It is a background of struggle for the last 25 years. I remember, and some of you may also recall, the "Long March" in China. Quite apart from its merits, that "Long March" was a terrific feat. It meant being hunted, being harassed, with many people collapsing and some surviving. They often found a habitat in the mountains and in the caves, and lived there for a number of years organizing themselves. Then came the Japanese invasion. They fought the Japanese invasion. That turned into a world war later.

Now, imagine what a powerful determining influence these factors must have had on the people who took part in the March of 8,000 miles which was an unprecedented thing. Then look at the present picture. Number one: these hundreds of millions of people of China, after 45 years of internal trouble, have got peace in China—at any rate, there are no marauding armies about, there are no bandits about. There is peace and order, whatever the system of government, which is a great relief after two generations of disorder. The peasant is cultivating his fields, and people can pursue, within limitations, no doubt, their avocations.

The people's reaction is that after 45 years of trouble they have peace. The second is their feeling of nationalism. They feel that their great country which had been kicked and tossed about for generations has become unified and strong and can stand up on its own feet and look any other country in the face. Look at it from the Chinese point of view. I am not, for the moment, considering communism or anti-communism. I tell you, a Chinese living in Singapore, Laos or elsewhere, even if he is completely anti-communist, is still proud of China's condition today. He has his nationalist pride that his State, his country, is strong and unified.

This is the background of China today. Of course, it did not require my going to China to know all this. But if you keep it in mind you will understand something of what is happening in China. You and I know very well that in China today they have got a certain political structure and a certain economic structure. The rulers of China are communists—convinced communists, there is no doubt about that. They

have evolved a political and economic system which is partly based on their Marxist ideas, and partly adapted to conditions in China. We all know that it is not full-blooded communism; it is adapted to their conditions. So, now, if you ask me, 'Is there freedom of the press there?', with all respect I shall say that question is rather unnecessary. The whole structure of government there is of a type which is completely different from parliamentary democracy. Whether you can call it democracy or not is another matter. They call it People's Democracy. That is an argument which we need not go into. My point is that it is different. We know it. What results it yields you can partly see now, and ultimately the future will show. It is the future that will show whether the results achieved by the methods they pursue—I am talking about national development—will be worthwhile or not or have been worth the price paid for them.

Each people, and specially these big chunks of humanity like India and China, with long records, as soon as they find freedom to function according to their wishes, are influenced by various external forces—industrial revolution, technological advancement, political ideas and so on. But if we are worth our salt, we have to stand on our own feet and function in accordance with our own thinking and conditioning of minds. I shall have little respect for India if it followed blindly, the American pattern or the Russian or the Chinese or the British. Then it would not be India but a pale imitation of somebody else. That does not mean that I do not respect the American, British or other patterns. What I say is that we shall have to function according to our thinking. What is the good of an individual who does not have an integrated personality, who merely copies something or somebody else—much more so a nation which just copies? I do not presume to criticize other countries for the way in which they have developed. But I am anxious to learn from other countries what may be good for me. We can learn much from Europe. We have learnt a good deal. We can learn much from the United States of America. But I think we can learn a good deal too from Russia and China, and more particularly now from China.

I shall tell you why. Because, quite apart from their system of government, the problems they face in China are far more similar to our problems than the problems of Europe or America. There are in China and India huge agricultural communities with vast populations, industrially and technologically backward, wanting to advance in welfare, wanting to have higher standards of life, wanting to industrialize, wanting to deal with land problems and all that. The nature of problems is similar between India and China. They are not so similar between India and Russia. The Soviet Union is a vast territory but very thinly inhabited, compared to India. We have the problem of vast numbers of human beings but limited land. The Soviet Union has plenty of land. See the consequences of this, apart from communism. If they in Russia want to deal with their land problems, it is very easy, because the population is small and land plentiful. With us human beings are too many, and land is little. That is a basic difference. Take our Gangetic Valley, which is heavily populated. The problem of our introducing, let us say, tractor cultivation in a heavily populated area is completely different from the problem of introducing tractor cultivation in a sparsely populated area, which the Soviet Union is. One has to approach the problem by taking into consideration various factors, quite apart from theories. That is why I say that the problems of India and China in regard to land development, industries, and even in regard to floods, are rather similar, though, on the other hand, as you know, there are basic differences in living standards and in mental outfit between the Chinese and us.

When I went to China, I was anxious to learn. They were dealing with some similar problems in engineering and flood control. I flew over the Central China area and immediately I thought of my flying over the Bihar area a few weeks earlier. It was the same picture—vast areas covered with water; I could see no end of them, there or here.

We all rely on some pictures or maps. But one of the obvious factors of the present age is that all maps have changed or are changing. Not only the physical maps, but, what is much more important, the mental pictures. This process began

after the First World War and you know what a big change it brought about. The process has continued after the Second World War. Among the major changes in the world are these changes in Asia—whether in India, China, Indonesia or Western Asia. I feel that the mental picture the people in the rest of the world have had of Asia no longer fits in with the present conditions in Asia. That is why they can neither understand Asia nor solve the problems of Asia. They try to solve them frequently, but without taking the people of Asia into consideration.

I went to China and spent about nine or ten days. There being so many similarities in our problems, I was constantly comparing how we were dealing with a particular problem, and how they had dealt with or were dealing with it. I am not going into details, but in some matters I took it that we had the advantage and had done better. In some matters I felt they had done much better. I tried objectively to understand things. Of course, the conditions of functioning are different. Remember that in China there is what they call “democratic centralism” which is a highly centralized form of government over a vast territory. Apart from certain territories which have some measure of autonomy, like Tibet, a large chunk of China has a highly centralized government. They have a method—a very widespread and effective method—of administration by local organs, conferences, etc., but power remains at the Centre. We, as you all know, have a federal State with autonomous provinces and a parliamentary democracy, which has many virtues but which also functions slowly. There they issue a decree as soon as they come to a decision, and it takes effect from the next day. We have to go through slow processes, introduction of a Bill, reference to select committee, first reading, second reading, third reading, opposition and so on. It takes years, and it may be that the Bill may be declared *ultra vires* by the Supreme Court afterwards. In all it is a slow-moving picture. I am greatly conscious of the delay that the democratic processes involve, but still I am convinced that for my country this system of parliamentary democracy is the best. Yet, it is not a question of my opinion or your opinion of what is best. In the final

analysis that system is the best which yields the best results from the point of view of human welfare, from the point of view of the welfare of the 360 million people in our country. I feel that our system of parliamentary democracy will yield results and is yielding results.

I come to another factor. Now, some of you gentlemen are constantly—often rightly but not always rightly—criticizing this Government here. There is hardly a day when I do not see some headlines about the corruption and ineptitude of the Government. On this general criticism I may declare that I think quite honestly that this conception of widespread corruption in the Government is totally wrong. Not that there is no corruption in the Government, but there is such a thing as a balanced outlook and a balanced judgment. I say I am prepared to compare my country with the other countries of the world. There are very few that are better off in this respect than our country, and the vast majority are infinitely worse, but leave them out. I said that here we have all this constant criticism and condemnation. There is none of that in China. There is a great deal of internal criticism on minor matters, but of what I might call criticism of the Government with regard to major policies, there is none. That is the way they function, and the result is that there are advantages and disadvantages. It is advantageous to them in the sense that it creates an optimistic atmosphere of great progress being made, while here if a person does not look round for himself, and merely reads the newspapers, he will feel that the country is going to the dogs.

AN INDEPENDENT APPROACH

I AM A LITTLE AFRAID that this House in its enthusiasm might perhaps imagine that we are doing more than we are really doing. I am referring particularly to the international sphere, because some hon. Members in their speeches seemed to make out that India was playing a very important role, almost a dominating role, in regard to some world problems. Let us have a more correct perspective.

I believe that we have helped, occasionally, in regard to the solution of some problems, and in the relaxation or lessening of tension. We might take due credit for that, but let us not go beyond that. After all a country's capacity to influence events is determined by various factors. You will find that India is lacking in most of those factors. If we have been successful in some measure, the success has been due not obviously to any kind of military strength or financial power, but because we took a correct view of events. If I may say so in all modesty, we understood them more correctly than others, because we were more in tune with the spirit of the age. We do not have the strength to threaten anybody; nor do we want to.

We feel, in so far as international policy is concerned, that right or wrong counts. But it is not the rightness of a proposition that makes it listened to but rather the person or the country which says so and the strength behind that country. The international policy of a country depends ultimately on the domestic state of affairs in that country; the two have to be in line and they cannot be isolated from each other. Indeed it is the internal state of affairs of a country that enables it to speak with some strength, force and authority in the international sphere. I do not wish to indulge in invidious comparisons. But hon. Members can look at our country as it is today and a number of other countries and decide for themselves how far India has progressed in the last six or seven years compared with most other countries. It is indeed due to this feeling that India is marching forward,

Speech in Lok Sabha during a debate on the President's Address,
February 25, 1955

that India is a country which is firmly established and is dynamic, that people in the rest of the world look upon us with a measure of respect.

One hears frequently about pacts and military alliances in Europe, in the Middle East, in South-East Asia and elsewhere. There are in the world today two mighty Powers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union. There are some other great Powers also, the United Kingdom and one or two others, who are also big in varying degree. I can understand, although I would not approve, military alliances between great Powers. That would have some meaning. But I do not understand military pacts and alliances between a huge giant of a power and a little pigmy of a country. It has no meaning in a military sense to me. In this nuclear age the only countries that count, from the nuclear war point of view, are those great countries which are, unfortunately, in a position to use these bombs. But to attach small countries to themselves in alliance really means—and I say so with all respect to those countries—that they are becoming very much dependent on these countries. Such associates do not add to their defensive power, for they have little or no military value. Perhaps such alliances have some psychological value. I wish to refrain from saying anything which might militate against others. But in this nuclear age, to think of war itself is insanity. Any person who has given thought to it—many generals, in England, France, U.S.A. and the Soviet Union have done so—would realize that war today is unthinkable, because a war is fought to achieve certain results, not to bring ruin on oneself. War, today, will bring ruin to every country involved, not only one. All the great countries appear to be clear about it and are absolutely certain that there is no country in the world which wants war. To talk about war-mongers and the rest is completely wrong. There may be some individuals who might want war, but no country wants it. If that is so, what is the value of this policy of military alliances and armaments? It does not logically follow from the first assumption. The development of the thermonuclear bomb has changed the whole picture of fighting today. What might have been good a few years ago is no longer good.

The fact that one country has a few more bombs than the other is of no great relevance. The point is that even the country that has less, has reached the saturation point, that is, it has enough to cause infinite damage to the other country. There is no real defence against nuclear weapons; you can at best damage or ruin the other country. When you have arrived at the saturation point, you have arrived at the stage of mutual extermination. Then the only way out is to prevent war, to avoid it. There is no other way. All talk of reduction of armaments, good as it is, does not help much. That is the first point we should remember.

Secondly, we must consider what use alliances and pacts really have in this age of nuclear warfare. As I said earlier, they do not help in a military sense, though psychologically, they may. I am not asking these countries to disband their armies or their air forces. The only effect of these pacts and alliances, it appears to me, is to hold a kind of threat. These threats are being thrown about by both the Power blocs. But even this business of threatening through military pacts has become obsolete in this nuclear age. You cannot threaten a big Power which has nuclear weapons, for it is not likely to be frightened. You can at best threaten small countries.

As things are today, we have reached a certain balance—it may be a very unstable balance, but it is still some kind of balance—when any kind of major aggression is likely to lead to a world war. That itself is a restraining factor. Whether aggression takes place in a small country or a big one, it tends to upset the unstable balance in the world and is therefore likely to lead to war. It is because of this that in the Geneva Conference there was so much argument about the Indo-China States. Either of the major parties was afraid that if any of these States linked up with or was coerced into joining one group, it would be to the disadvantage of the other. For instance, suppose countries like Laos and Cambodia were overwhelmed and drawn into the sphere of China, the countries on the other side would naturally be frightened. On the other hand, if Laos and Cambodia became hostile to China and could be used as bases for an attack on China, naturally China would object to it very strongly. What is the

way out of the difficulty? Either you have war to decide who is stronger, or you place Laos, Cambodia and all the Indo-China States more or less outside the spheres of influence, outside the alignments, and outside the military pacts of the two groups, so that both could feel, at least to some extent, secure in the knowledge that these Indo-China States were not going to be used against them. There is no other way out. So at Geneva, they wisely decided, more or less, though not in clear language, that the Indo-China States should keep out of military pacts or alliances on either side, or, in other words, remain neutralized.

If you extend the argument, you will see that the only way to avoid conflicts is to accept things more or less as they are. No doubt many things require to be changed, but you must not think of changing them by war. War does not do what you want to do; it does something much worse. Further, by enlarging the area of peace, that is, of countries which are not aligned to this group or that, but which are friendly to both, you reduce the chance of war.

As the House knows, the policy adopted by India and followed consistently during the last few years has been appreciated by many countries. Some other countries of Asia, not because of us, but because of their own reasons, have followed a similar policy. Even countries which have not followed it have begun to appreciate our policy. We are following it because we are convinced that it is the right policy. We would follow it even if there was no other country in the world that followed it. It is not a question, as some hon. Members seem to imagine, of balancing the considerations and sitting on the fence. Ours is a positive policy and we follow it with conviction and faith.

The House knows of some countries which are our good friends in Asia, like Burma and Indonesia who have been following a similar policy in international affairs. Recently, when the President of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia had come here, he and I issued a statement in which reference was made to Panchsheel, the Five Principles. That indicates how the idea is spreading. I can assure this House that even though many Governments may not publicly approve of

Panchsheel, people in many countries have been attracted to it more and more.

Among the many schools of thought and action in international affairs today is the school of strong action, as it calls itself. I suppose it is a relic of the old days when a warship or cruiser was sent down to frighten into submission any small country which misbehaved. Strong action might bring results when a very big country shows the mailed fist to a small country, but strong action does not go very far when the other country has also got a big fist. Then there is the school which talks about negotiation through strength. It is true that nobody will listen to you if you are weak. But, as you develop your strength to negotiate, unfortunately the other party also goes on developing its strength.

Then there is the school of—shall I say—learned confusion. It talks very learnedly about international affairs, delivers speeches, writes articles, but never gets out of a confused state of mind. There is a fourth school, equally prominent, of ignorant confusion. So that, between all these various schools it is a little difficult to get to know where we are and what we are, more especially when the problem relates to Asia, because most of the currents of thought today in international affairs come from Europe and America. They are great countries, to be respected, but the greatness of a country does not necessarily endow it with greater understanding of some other country; and the fact that Asia has changed and is changing has not wholly been grasped by many people in other continents. Therefore their confusion is the greater when thinking of Asia.

The world seems to be divided into two mighty camps, the communist and the anti-communist, and either party cannot understand how anyone can be foolish enough not to line up with itself. That just shows how little understanding these people have of the mind of Asia. Talking of India only, and not of all Asia, we have fairly clear ideas about our political and economic structure. We function in this country under a Constitution which may be described as a parliamentary democracy. It has not been imposed upon us. We propose to continue with it. We do not intend changing it.

We intend to function on the economic plane, too, in our own way. With all respect to some hon. Members opposite, we have no intention to turn communists. At the same time, we have no intention of being dragooned in any other direction. Putting it simply, we mean no ill to anybody. Every country has a right to choose its own path and go along it. We have chosen our path and we propose to go along it, and to vary it as and when we choose, not at somebody's dictate or pressure; and we are not afraid of any other country imposing its will upon us by military methods or any other methods. The only way for us is to build up our own strength, which we intend doing. Meanwhile we want to be friendly with other countries. Our thinking and our approach do not fit in with this great crusade of communism or crusade of anti-communism.

Many people in those countries do not understand this approach of ours. And yet many countries of Asia have inevitably to follow this policy, unless they are much too weak to stand on their own feet. When they seek shelter and help it is because they cannot rely upon themselves. There is a type of help which countries take in friendship, which we are willing to take, of course, but there is another type of help which countries take because they are too weak to stand on their own legs. Well, that help does not help at all, because it weakens. And hence, we have been careful in this matter to make it clear always that our policies cannot be affected by and there must be no strings attached to any kind of help that we get, and that we would rather struggle through ourselves without any help than have our policies affected in any way by outside pressure.

I was mentioning just now the change in Asia which is taking many forms. Presently, in the course of about seven weeks, there is going to be a conference at Bandung in Indonesia—an Asian-African conference it is called—to which a number of independent countries of Asia and Africa have been invited. So far as I know, every country that has been invited is likely to attend. I am not quite sure that all the replies have come, but I think they will all attend. What this conference is going to do is not up to me or even the

sponsoring countries to say. It is the conference which will draw up its own agenda and decide. I was therefore a little surprised when the hon. Member, Shri Asoka Mehta, said something about the conference drawing up a vast programme for the liberation of suppressed countries. We are all for the liberation of suppressed countries, but the idea of associating the conference with a programme of this type seems to me completely to misunderstand its purpose. The House will remember it will be an official-level conference in which Governments will be represented. In fact, Prime Ministers will be attending it, from countries with completely different ideologies and political and economic structures. There will be countries in this Conference which are aligned to this or that great Power bloc, and there are countries like India and Burma and Indonesia which are not aligned with any. This assortment of countries of Asia and Africa will therefore have much in common, and also much not in common. It is going to be an extraordinary meeting. The mere fact of our meeting is of the highest significance. It is the first time that such a meeting is taking place. It represents, rather unconsciously, subconsciously, Asia and Africa coming to the forefront. I do not know whether this idea was present wholly in the mind of the original sponsor of this conference, but because the proposal was made at the right time, it accorded with the spirit of the times.

By its very nature, a conference of this type is hardly likely to discuss controversial issues as between the countries represented there. Also, if I may express my own opinion, I hope it will not function as if it was setting up a group in rivalry to the others. It is essentially an experiment in coexistence, for the countries of Asia and Africa—some of which are inclined this way, and some the other way in regard to the Power blocs—are meeting together in a friendly way and trying to find what common ground there is for co-operation in the economic, cultural and political fields. Therefore, it is a development of great importance from the point of view not only of Asia but of the world.

The hon. Member, Shrimati Renu Chakravartty, did me the honour of quoting at some length from one of my own

books about democracy. I have looked up the passage, and I may tell her that by and large I agree with what I had written twenty-two years ago, although I hope I have developed very much since then. What I then said—if I might repeat it—was that democracy, if it is confined to political democracy, and does not become economic democracy at all, is not full democracy. Many people want to hide themselves under this cloak of political democracy, and prevent other kinds of progress. When we speak of political democracy we should remember that adult suffrage is a very recent development even in the Western countries. The argument that political democracy was in favour of vested interests, while quite true when the franchise was small and restricted, does not apply with the same force when there is adult suffrage in a country.

The problem that we really have to face is whether the changes we want to make in the economic domain can be effected peacefully by the democratic method or not. If democracy does not function in the political plane properly, then there is no way to bring about a change except by some kind of pressure, violence or revolution. But where this peaceful method is available, and where there is adult suffrage, there the question of trying to change things by violence is absurd and wholly wrong. To my thinking, it means that a small number of people are trying to impose their will, by means of violence, on a much larger number, having failed to change their opinions by the normal method of reasoning or argument. That, certainly, is not democracy, political or economic or any other. Therefore, the problem before us is to have democracy—we have it politically—and to extend it in the economic field.

ASIA AND AFRICA AWAKE

FOR SEVEN DAYS we have been in this pleasant city of Bandung, and Bandung has been the focal centre—I might even say the capital—of Asia and Africa during this period.

We have met here because of an irrepressible urge amongst the people of Asia and Africa. We have met because mighty forces are at work in these great continents, moving millions of people, creating in their minds urges and passions and desires for a change in their condition.

So we met and what have we achieved? Well, you have seen the draft statement which has been read to you. I think it represents a considerable achievement. But I should like to draw your attention even more to the importance of the fact that we have met here together, seen and made friends with one another and argued with one another to find a solution for our common problems.

My friend the hon. Prime Minister of Burma referred to our diversities of opinion as differences, and we wrestled with one another these seven days because we wanted to arrive at a common opinion and common outlook. Obviously, the world looks different according to the angle from which you look at it. If you are sitting in the far east of Asia, you have a certain perspective of the world and the world's problems. If you are sitting in the far west of Asia, you have a different perspective. Again, if you are in Africa, it will be quite different.

We all came with our own perspectives, each considering his own problem the most important in the world. At the same time, we are trying to understand the big problems of the world, and to fit our problems into this larger context, because in the ultimate analysis, all our problems, however important they may be, cannot be kept apart from these larger problems. Thus, how can we solve our problems if peace itself is in danger? So our primary consideration is peace. All of us are passionately eager to advance our

Speech at the concluding session of the Asian-African Conference at Bandung, Indonesia, April 24, 1955

countries peacefully. We have been backward. We have been left behind in the race, and now we have a chance again to make good. We have to make good rapidly because of the compulsion of events. If we do not make good now, we shall fade away not to rise again for a long time to come.

We are determined not to fail. We are determined, in this new phase of Asia and Africa, to make good. We are determined not to be dominated in any way by any other country or continent. We are determined to bring happiness and prosperity to our people and to discard the age-old shackles that have tied us not only politically but economically—the shackles of colonialism and other shackles of our own making. No doubt there were differences in our discussions, and great criticism was levelled at certain resolutions; we had to meet such criticism because we wanted to achieve a common goal. But it is not resolutions that will solve the problems that face us today. Only our practices and actions will bring success to our aims and ideals. It is only then that we can make good what we lost in the past. We have to take a realistic view of all things and face them in a realistic spirit.

But there is yet another spirit in Asia today. Asia is no longer passive; it has been passive enough in the past. It is no longer a submissive Asia; it has tolerated submissiveness too long. The Asia of today is dynamic; it is full of life. Asia might make mistakes, but they do not matter so long as she is alive. Where there is life there is advance.

Our achievements at this Conference have been great—because we have been in general agreement in all our resolutions—but much greater has been the background of all those agreements. We had to wrestle with our differences. We are not yes-men sitting here to say 'yes' to this country or that, not even to one another. We are great countries of the world who live in freedom without dictation. If there is anything that Asia wants to tell the world, it is that there is going to be no dictation in the future. There will be no yes-men in Asia nor in Africa, I hope. We had enough of that in the past. We value the friendship of the great countries, but we can only sit with them as brothers.

I say this not in any spirit of hatred or dislike or

aggressiveness in regard to Europe or America. We have sent them our greetings, all of us here, and we want to be friends with them and to co-operate with them. But in the future we shall only co-operate as equals; there is no friendship when nations are not equal, when one has to obey the other and when one dominates the other. That is why we raise our voices against domination and colonialism, from which many of us have suffered for so long. And that is why we have to be very careful to see that no other form of domination comes our way. We want to be friends with the West and friends with the East and friends with everybody. The only approach to the mind and spirit of Asia is the approach of toleration and friendship and co-operation, not the approach of aggressiveness.

I wish to speak no ill of anybody. In Asia, all of us have many faults as countries and as individuals. Our past history shows that. Nevertheless, I say that Europe has been in the past a continent full of conflicts, full of trouble, full of hatred. Europe's conflicts continue, its wars continue and we have been dragged into these wars because we were tied to Europe's chariot wheels. Are we going to continue to be tied to Europe's troubles, Europe's hatreds and Europe's conflicts? I hope not.

Of course, Europe and Asia and America are all dependent on one another. It is not right to think in terms of isolation in this modern world which is moving towards the ideal of one world. Nevertheless Europe and some other great countries, whatever their political persuasion may be, have got into the habit of thinking that their quarrels are the world's quarrels and that therefore the world must submit to them. I do not follow that reasoning. I do not want anybody to quarrel in Europe, Asia or America, but if the others quarrel, why should I quarrel and why should I be dragged into their quarrels and wars?

I realize, as the Prime Minister of Burma said, that we cannot exercise any decisive influence on the world. But there is no doubt that our influence will grow. It is growing, in fact, and we do exercise some influence even today. But whether our influence is great or small, it must be exercised

in the right direction, in a direction which reflects the integrity of purpose and ideals and objectives embodied in our resolution. This resolution represents the ideals and the new dynamism of Asia. We are not copies of Europeans or Americans or Russians. We are Asians and Africans. It would not be creditable for our dignity and new freedom if we were camp followers of America or Russia or any other country of Europe.

As I said, we mean no ill to anybody. We send our greetings to Europe and America. We send our greetings to Australia and New Zealand. And indeed Australia and New Zealand are almost in our region. They certainly do not belong to Europe, much less to America. They are next to us and I should like Australia and New Zealand to come nearer to Asia. I would welcome them because I do not want what we say or do to be based on racial prejudices. We have had enough of this racialism elsewhere.

We have passed resolutions about conditions in this or that country. But I think there is nothing more terrible than the infinite tragedy of Africa in the past few hundred years. Everything else pales into insignificance when I think of the infinite tragedy of Africa ever since the days when millions of Africans were carried away as galley slaves to America and elsewhere, half of them dying in the galleys. We must accept responsibility for it, all of us, even though we ourselves were not directly involved. But unfortunately, in a different sense, even now the tragedy of Africa is greater than that of any other continent, whether it is racial or political. It is up to Asia to help Africa to the best of her ability because we are sister continents.

I am sure that the Conference has left its powerful impress on the minds of all who are here. I am sure that it has left an impress on the mind of the world. We came here as agents of historic destiny and we have made history here. We have to live up to what we have said, and even more so, to what the world expects of us, what Asia expects of us, what the millions in these countries expect of us. I hope we shall be worthy of the people's faith and our destiny.

REPORT ON BANDUNG

THE HOUSE will be interested to have some account from me of the recent Asian-African Conference held at Bandung.

At the meeting of the Prime Ministers of Burma, Ceylon, Pakistan, Indonesia and India at Bogor in December last, it was decided to convene such a Conference under the joint sponsorship of the five Prime Ministers. The main purposes of the Conference were set out as follows :

- To promote goodwill and co-operation;

- To consider social, economic and cultural problems, and the problems of special interest to Asian and African peoples; and finally,

- To view the position of Asia and Africa in the world today and the contribution they could make to the promotion of world peace and co-operation.

The Prime Ministers further agreed that the Conference should be composed of all the independent and near-independent nations of the continents of Asia and Africa. In the implementation of this principle, with minor variations, they decided to invite the representatives of twenty-five countries, who, together with themselves, thirty in all, could compose the Conference. The invitations thus extended were on a geographical and not on an ideological or racial basis. It is not only significant, but impressive, that all but one responded to the invitation of the sponsors and were represented at the Conference in most cases by Prime Ministers or Foreign Ministers, and in others by their senior statesmen.

Arrangements for the Conference were entrusted to a joint secretariat composed of the five sponsoring nations. The main burden of organization, however, including accommodation and the provision of all facilities to the visitors, fell upon the Indonesian Government. I am happy to pay a wholehearted tribute to the Government and the Prime Minister of the Republic of Indonesia for the excellent arrangements that had been made and the enormous amount of labour and

attention which they devoted to their task. Their achievements in this regard contributed in no small measure to the success of the Conference itself.

The Asian-African Conference was opened on April 18 by the distinguished President of the Republic of Indonesia, Dr. Ahmed Sukarno. The President's opening address to the Conference gave not only an inspiring and courageous lead to the delegates present, but proclaimed to the world the spirit of resurgent Asia. To us in India President Sukarno's address is a further reminder of the close ties of our two countries and of our joint endeavours in the cause of Asian freedom.

I think we may all profit by the concluding words of his speech which are well worth recalling. He said :

"Let us not be bitter about the past, but let us keep our eyes firmly on the future. Let us remember that no blessing of God is so sweet as life and liberty. Let us remember that the stature of all mankind is diminished so long as nations or parts of nations are still unfree. Let us remember that the highest purpose of man is the liberation of man from his bonds of fear, his bonds of poverty, the liberation of man from the physical, spiritual and intellectual bonds which have for long stunted the development of humanity's majority.

"And let us remember, Sisters and Brothers, that for the sake of all that, we Asians and Africans must be united."

Introductory speeches made in the plenary session by a number of delegations revealed the diversities as well as the common outlook that prevailed and, thus to an extent, projected both the common purposes of the Conference and the difficult tasks before it. The rest of the work of the Conference, except for its last session, was conducted in committee, in private sessions, as being more calculated to further the purposes of the Conference and to accomplish them with expedition.

It was part of the decisions at Bogor that the Conference should draw up its own agenda. This was not an evasion of responsibilities by the sponsors but a course deliberately adopted to make the Conference the master of its own tasks and procedures.

Accordingly, the Conference settled its agenda on the

lines of the main purpose set out at Bogor. The Conference also decided that its final decision should set out the consensus of its views.

Economic and cultural issues were referred to separate committees and their reports were finally adopted by the Committee of the whole Conference. This committee also dealt with the remainder of the agenda including the main political issues. The House will be familiar, from the final communique of the Conference which has been laid on the table of the House, with the proceedings of these committees and the recommendations made. It is, however, relevant to draw attention to their main characteristics. These recommendations wisely avoided any provision for setting up additional machinery of inter-nation co-operation, but, on the other hand, sought to rely on existing international machinery in part and, for the rest, on such decisions as individual Governments may, by contact and negotiation, find it possible to make. I respectfully submit to the House that in dealings between sovereign governments, this is both wise and practical step to adopt. It is important, further, to note that all delegations without exception realized the importance of both economic and cultural relations. The decisions represent a break-away from the generally accepted belief and practice that Asia, in matters of technical aid, financial or cultural co-operation and exchange of experience, must rely exclusively on the non-Asian world. Detailed recommendations apart, the reports of these committees, which became the decision of the Conference, proclaim the reaching out of Asian countries to one another and their determination to profit by one another's experience on the basis of mutual co-operation.

In the economic field, the subjects dealt with include technical assistance, early establishment of a Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development; appointment of liaison officers by participating countries; stabilization of commodity trade and prices through bilateral and multi-lateral arrangements; increased processing of raw materials; study of shipping and transport problems; establishment of national and regional banks and insurance companies;

development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes; and exchange of information and ideas on matters of mutual interest.

In the cultural field, the Conference similarly dealt with a wide range of subjects, recognizing that the most powerful means of promoting understanding among nations is the development of cultural co-operation. The links that bound the Asian and African countries together in earlier ages had been sundered in their more recent history of foreign conquest and annexation. The New Asia would seek to revive the old ties and build newer and better forms of relationship. While the Asian renaissance has legitimately and naturally played an important part in the thinking of the delegates, it is important they remembered and recorded, in accordance with the age-old traditions of tolerance and universality, that the Conference believed that Asian and African cultural co-operation should be developed in the larger context of world co-operation.

As a practical step, the Conference decided that the endeavours of the respective countries in the field of cultural co-operation should be directed towards better knowledge of each other's country, mutual cultural exchanges and the exchange of information, and that the best results would be achieved by pursuing bilateral arrangements, each country taking action on its own in the best ways open to it.

The work of the committee of the whole Conference was devoted to problems mainly grouped under the headings of Human Rights and Self-determination; Problems of Dependent Peoples, and the Promotion of World Peace and Co-operation. Under each head were grouped a large number of specific problems. In the consideration of Human Rights and Self-determination, specific problems, such as racial discrimination and segregation, were considered. Special consideration was given to the Union of South Africa and the position of people of Indian and Pakistan origin in that country as well as to the problem of Palestine in its relation to world peace, human rights and the plight of the refugees.

The problem of Dependent Peoples or colonialism was the subject which at once created both pronounced agreement and disagreement. In the condemnation of colonialism

in its well-understood sense, namely, the rule of one people by another, with its attendant evils, the Conference was at one. It affirmed its support to those still struggling to attain their independence and called upon the Powers concerned to grant them independence. Special attention was paid to the problem of Morocco, Tunisia and Algeria as well as to West Irian. Aden, which is a British Protectorate and is in a different category, also came in for consideration.

There was, however, another and different view in the Conference which sought to bring under colonialism and to include in these above affirmations the alleged conditions in some countries which are sovereign nations. Some of these are members of the United Nations and all of them are independent in terms of international law and practice. They have diplomatic relations with ourselves and other countries of the world including the Big Powers. It appeared to us that irrespective of whatever views may be held in regard to the conditions prevailing in these countries or of relationships that may exist between the Soviet Union and them, they could in no way be called colonies nor could their alleged problems come under the classification of colonialism. To so include them in any general statement on behalf of the Conference could be accomplished only by acceptance by a great number of the participants of the Conference, including ourselves, of political views and attitudes which are not theirs. It is no injustice to anyone concerned to say that this controversy reflects a projection of the cold war affiliations into the arena of the Asian-African Conference. While these countries concerned did and indeed had a right to hold their own views and position on this as on any other matter, such views could not become part of any formulation on behalf of the Conference. It was, however, entirely to the good that these conflicting views were aired and much to the credit of the Conference that after patient and persistent endeavour, a formulation which did not do violence to the firmly held opinions of all concerned was forthcoming. This is a matter of which it may be said that one of the purposes of the Conference, namely, to recognize diversities but to find unity, stands vindicated.

Asia and Africa also spoke with unanimity against the production and use of weapons of mass destruction. The Conference called for their total prohibition, and for the establishment and maintenance of such prohibition by efficient international control. It also called for the suspension of experiments with such weapons. The concern of Asian and African countries about the armaments race and the imperative necessity of disarmament also found expression.

The most important decision of the Conference is the "Declaration on World Peace and Co-operation." The nations assembled set out the principles which should govern relations between them and indeed the countries of the world as a whole. These are capable of universal application and are historic in their significance. We in India have in recent months sought to formulate the principles which should govern our relations with other countries and often spoken of them as the Five Principles. In the Bandung Declaration we find the full embodiment of these Five Principles and the addition to them of elaborations which reinforce these principles. We have reason to feel happy that this Conference, representative of more than half the population of the world, has declared its adherence to the tenets that should guide their conduct and govern the relations of the nations of the world if world peace and co-operation are to be achieved.

The House will remember that when the Five Principles, or the Panchsheel as we have called them, emerged, they attracted much attention as well as some opposition from different parts of the world. We have maintained that they contain the essence of the principles of relationship which would promote world peace and co-operation. We have not sought to point to them as though they were divine commandments or as though there was a particular sanctity either about the number or about their formulation. The essence of them is the substance, and this has been embodied in the Bandung Declaration. Some alternatives had been proposed and some of these even formulated contradictory positions. The final declaration embodies no contradictions. The Government of India is in total agreement with the principles set out in the Bandung Declaration and will honour them.

They contain nothing that is against the interests of our country, or the established principles of our foreign policy.

The Declaration includes a clause which has a reference to collective defence. The House knows that we are opposed to military pacts and I have repeatedly stated that these pacts based upon the idea of balance of power and 'negotiation from strength' and the grouping of nations into rival camps are not, in our view, a contribution to peace. We maintain that view. The Bandung Declaration, however, relates to self-defence in terms of the Charter of the United Nations. The provisions of the Charter (Article 51) make it clear that the inherent right of self-defence, individual or collective, is "if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security". I also invite a reference to Chapter VIII of the Charter where the conditions about regional arrangements are set out in detail. It has been stated in the Bandung Declaration in express terms that these rights of collective defence should be in accordance with the Charter. We have not only no objection to this formulation but we welcome it. We have subscribed to collective defence for the purposes defined in the Charter. It will also be noted that the Bandung Declaration further finds place for two specific safeguards in relation to this matter, namely, that there should be no external pressures on nations, and that collective defence arrangements should not be used to serve the particular interests of the Big Powers. We are also happy that the Declaration begins with a statement of adherence to Human Rights and therefore to the fundamental values of civilization. If the Conference made no other decision than the formulation of the principles of the Bandung Declaration, it would have been a signal achievement.

So much for the actual work and achievement within the Conference itself. But any estimate of this historic week at Bandung would be incomplete and its picture would be inadequate if we did not take into account the many contacts established, the relations that have emerged, the prejudices that have been removed and the friendships that have been

formed. More particularly, reference should be made to the conversations and, happily, some constructive results arising from private talks. Such results have been achieved in regard to some of the difficulties that had arisen in relation to the implementation of the Geneva decisions in Indo-China. Direct meetings of the parties concerned and the good offices of others, including ourselves, have been able to help to resolve these difficulties and create greater understanding and friendship. This is the position in regard to Cambodia, Laos and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. We regret, however, that we have not been able to make progress in this regard in respect of South Viet-Nam. This must await time and further endeavour.

The House is aware that the Prime Minister of China made, while he was at Bandung, a public statement announcing his readiness to enter into direct negotiations with the United States to discuss the question of relaxing tension in the Far East and especially the question of relaxing tension in the Formosa area. We have known for some time that China was willing to enter into direct talks, and other parties concerned have also not been unaware of it. The announcement itself does not therefore represent a new attitude on the part of China, but the fact that this has been publicly stated at a gathering of the Asian and African nations represents a further and wholesome development. If this is availed of by all concerned, it can lead to an approach towards peaceful settlement.

I had several conversations with Premier Chou En-lai. Some of these related to Formosa. At my request Shri Krishna Menon also explored certain aspects of this question with the Prime Minister of China. In the last few months we have also gained some impressions on the reactions and the attitude in Washington, London and Ottawa in regard to the Formosan question. We cannot speak for other Governments and can only form our own impressions and act according to our judgment of them. We have increasingly felt that efforts to bridge the gulf are imperative in view of the gravity of the crisis and the grim alternative that faces us if there are to be no negotiations. We feel and hope that patient and persistent endeavour

may produce results or at least show the way to them. We have the privilege and advantage of being friendly to both sides in this dispute. We entertain no prejudices and do not feel ourselves barred in respect of any approach that will lead to peace. We propose, therefore, to avail ourselves of such opportunities as are open to us to help resolve this grave crisis. In order to continue the Bandung talks, Premier Chou En-lai has invited Shri Krishna Menon to go to Peking. I have gladly agreed to this.

The Bandung Conference has been a historic event. If it only met, the meeting itself would have been a great achievement, as it would have represented the emergence of a new Asia and Africa, of new nations who are on the march towards the fulfilment of their independence and of their sense of their role in the world. Bandung proclaimed the political emergence in world affairs of over half the world's population. It presented no unfriendly challenge or hostility to anyone but proclaimed a new and rich contribution. Happily that contribution is not by way of threat or force or the creation of new power blocs. Bandung proclaimed to the world the capacity of the new nations of Asia and Africa for practical idealism, for we conducted our business in a short time and reached agreements of practical value, not quite usual with international conferences. We did not permit our sense of unity or our success to drive us into isolation and egocentricity. Each major decision of the Conference happily refers to the United Nations and to world problems and ideals. We believe that from Bandung our great organization, the United Nations, has derived strength. This means in turn that Asia and Africa must play an increasing role in the conduct and the destiny of the world organization.

The Bandung Conference attracted world attention. In the beginning it invited ridicule and perhaps hostility. This turned to curiosity, expectation and, I am happy to say, later to a measure of goodwill and friendship. In the observations I submitted in the final plenary session of the Conference, I ventured to ask the Conference to send its good wishes to our neighbours in Australia and New Zealand for whom we have nothing but the most fraternal feelings, as indeed to the rest

of the world. I feel that this is the message of the Asian and African Conference and also the real spirit of our newly liberated nations towards the older and well-established countries and peoples. To those still dependent, but are struggling for freedom, Bandung presented hope to sustain them in their courageous fight and in their struggle for freedom and justice.

While the achievements and the significance of the meeting at Bandung have been great and epoch-making, it would be a misreading of history to regard Bandung as though it was an isolated occurrence and not part of a great movement of human history. It is this latter that is the more correct and historical view to take.

Finally, I would ask the House not only to think of the success and achievements of the Conference, but of the great tasks and responsibilities which come to us as a result of our participation in this Conference. The Government of India are confident that in the discharge of these responsibilities, our country and our people will not be wanting. Thus we will take another step in the fulfilment of our historic destiny.

VISIT TO RUSSIA

TWO WEEKS AGO we came to the Soviet Union and soon we shall be leaving this great country. During this period we have travelled some 13,000 kilometres and visited many a famous city and seen many wonderful things. But most wonderful of all has been the welcome that we received wherever we went and the affection that the people showered upon us. We are infinitely grateful for this affection and welcome and I cannot express my thanks to the people of the Soviet Union adequately in words. Nevertheless, I wish to express our gratitude to you, Mr. Prime Minister, to your Government and to your people, and I would beg of you to

convey this expression of our deep feeling to the people of the Soviet Union who have so honoured us.

We came here to convey to the people of this great country greetings and good wishes of the Indian people and we go back laden with your affection and good wishes for our country and our people. We did not come here as strangers, for many of us have followed with deep interest the great changes and developments that have taken place in this country. Almost contemporaneously with your October Revolution under the leadership of the great Lenin we in India started a new phase of our struggle for freedom. Our people were engrossed in this struggle for many years and faced heavy repression with courage and endurance. Even though we pursued a different path in our struggle under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi we admired Lenin and were influenced by his example. In spite of this difference in our methods there was at no time an unfriendly feeling among our people towards the people of the Soviet Union.

We did not understand some of the developments in your country even as you might not have understood much that we did. We wished the Soviet Union well in the great and novel experiment she was making and tried to learn from it where we could. The backgrounds of our respective countries—our geography, history, traditions, culture and the circumstances wherein we had to function—were different.

We believed that the domination of one country over another was bad and while we struggled for our own freedom we sympathized with the endeavours of other countries suffering alien or autocratic rule to free themselves. Each country and people are conditioned by their own past and by the experience they go through and they thus develop a certain individuality. They cannot progress under an alien rule or when something is imposed on them. They can grow only if they develop their own strength and self-reliance and maintain their own integrity. We have all to learn from others and we cannot isolate ourselves, but this learning cannot be fruitful if it is an imposition.

We believe in democracy and in equality and in the removal of special privileges and we have set ourselves the

goal of developing a socialistic pattern of society in our country through peaceful methods. Whatever shape that pattern or democracy might take, it must lead to open access to knowledge and equal opportunity to all.

It is in recognition of the right of each country to fashion its own destiny that the Indian Government and the People's Government of China agreed to the Five Principles to govern their relations with each other. These principles were: Respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty; Non-aggression; Non-interference in each other's internal affairs; Equality and mutual benefit; and Peaceful co-existence. Subsequently these principles were accepted by Burma and Yugoslavia, and the Soviet Government has also expressed its approval of them.

At the Bandung Conference these principles were elaborated into ten and embodied in a declaration on world peace and co-operation. Thus over thirty countries have accepted them. I have no doubt that these principles of international behaviour, if accepted and acted upon by all countries of the world, would go a long way to put an end to the fears and apprehensions which cast dark shadows over the world.

The progress of science and of its offspring, technology, has changed the world we live in, and recent advances in science are changing the way men think of themselves and of the world. Even conceptions of time and space have changed and vast expanses open out for us to explore the mysteries of nature and to apply our knowledge for the betterment of humanity.

Science and technology have freed humanity from many of its burdens and given us this new perspective and great power. This power can be used for the good of all, if wisdom governs our actions; but if the world is mad or foolish, it can destroy itself just when great advance and triumphs are almost within its grasp.

The question of peace therefore becomes of paramount importance if this world of ours is to make progress or indeed even survive. Peace in our view is not merely abstention from war but an active and positive approach to international relations leading, first, to the lessening of the present tension

through an attempt to solve our problems by methods of negotiation, and then, to a growing co-operation between nations in various ways—cultural and scientific contacts, increase in trade and commerce, and exchange of ideas, experience and information.

We should endeavour to remove all walls and barriers to the growth of our minds and hearts such as come in the way of international co-operation. There is no reason why different countries having different political or social or economic systems should not co-operate in this way, provided there is no interference with one another and no imposition or attempt to dominate.

Wherever I have gone in the Soviet Union I have found a passion for peace. I believe that the vast majority of the people in every country hunger for peace, but fear of others often clouds their minds and makes them act in a different way. We must shed this fear and hatred, and try to cultivate the climate of peace. Out of war or threat of war or continuous preparation for war no peace can emerge.

In India we have been devoted to the cause of peace, and even in our struggle we have endeavoured to pursue methods of peace. For our own progress as well as for causes that are dear to us, peace is essential. We will therefore strive for peace to the utmost of our ability and co-operate with other nations in this vital task.

I should like to congratulate the Government of the Soviet Union on the several steps it has taken in recent months which have lessened world tension and have contributed to the cause of peace. In particular, I trust that the recent proposals of the Soviet Union with regard to disarmament will lead to progress being made towards the solution of this difficult problem. Disarmament is essential if fear is to be removed and peace assured.

We plan for our material and cultural advance in our respective countries. Let us also plan for the peaceful co-operation of different countries for the common good and the elimination of war.

Countries make pacts and alliances often through fear of some other country or countries. Let our coming together be

because we like each other and wish to co-operate, and not because we dislike others and wish to do them injury.

As I speak to you, the United Nations is holding a special session in San Francisco to celebrate the tenth anniversary of its foundation. The United Nations is based on a Charter which is nobly worded and aims at peaceful co-operation. Hopes that the peoples of the world had in this world organization have not been wholly fulfilled and much has happened that has come in the way of the ideals of the Charter. I earnestly hope that in this new decade of the U.N. which is now beginning, these hopes will find fulfilment. But the U.N. cannot represent all the peoples of the world if some nations are kept out of its scope.

More particularly we have felt that the non-recognition by the U. N. of the great People's Republic of China is not only an anomaly and not in keeping with the spirit of the Charter, but is a danger to the promotion of peace and the solution of the world's problems. One of the most vital problems today is that of the Far East and this cannot be settled without the goodwill and co-operation of the People's Republic of China. I trust that we shall soon see the People's Republic of China taking its rightful place in the U.N. and that attempts being made to find a solution to the problems of the Far East will meet with increasing success.

We live in a vital, developing world going forward to new discoveries and new triumphs which place increasing power at man's disposal. Let us hope this power will be controlled and governed by wisdom and tolerance, with each nation contributing to the common good.

I have been deeply impressed by the great achievements of the Soviet Union. I have seen the transformation of this vast land through the industry of its people and the great urge that drives them forward to better their own condition. I have admired the music, dancing and superb ballets that I have seen. I have been impressed most of all by the great care taken by the State and by the people of children and the younger generation of this great country. I wish to thank you again, Mr. Prime Minister, and your Government and your people for your friendliness and generous hospitality.

The people of India wish you well and look forward to co-operation with you in many fields of common endeavour for the good of our respective countries as well as for the larger cause of humanity.

THE CONCEPT OF PANCHSHEEL

AS THE HOUSE KNOWS, there is a proposal that India should undertake some responsibilities in regard to the Chinese civilians or nationals in the United States of America. I think it may be said without undue exaggeration that India has played a significant role in times of difficulty. Often enough it was not a public role, but a gentle role of friendly approach to the parties concerned. This has sometimes helped in bringing them nearer to one another. We have never sought to be, and we have never acted as, mediators. The word 'mediator' is often bandied about. But there is no question of mediation between great countries. All that we have suggested and sought to bring about is that the great countries should face each other, talk to each other and decide their problems themselves. It is not for us to advise them what to do. We can at best remove some obstacles which have arisen during the last few years.

India's contribution in this direction may perhaps be put in one word or two, Panchsheel, and the ideas underlying it. There is nothing new about those ideas except their application to a particular context. And the House will notice that ever since these ideas of peaceful coexistence were initially mentioned and promulgated, not only have they spread in the world and influenced more and more countries, but they have progressively acquired a greater depth and meaning. That is, from being a word used rather loosely, Panchsheel has begun to acquire a specific meaning and significance in world affairs.

From a speech in Lok Sabha, September 17, 1955

I think we may take some credit for spreading this conception of a peaceful settlement, and above all, of non-interference. That each country should carve out its own destiny without interfering with others is an important conception, though there is nothing new about it. No great truths may be new. But it is true that an idea like non-interference requires emphasis because there has been in the past a tendency for great countries to interfere with others, to bring pressure to bear upon them, and to want these others to line up with them. I suppose that is a natural result of bigness. It has taken place throughout history.

This stress on non-interference of any kind—political, economic or ideological—is an important factor in the world situation today. The fact that it will not be wholly acted upon here and there is really of little relevance. You make a law, and the law gradually influences the whole structure of life in a country, even though some people may not obey it. Even those who do not believe in it gradually come within its scope.

The conception of Panchsheel means that there may be different ways of progress, possibly different outlooks, but that, broadly, the ultimate objectives may be the same. If I may use another type of analogy, truth is not confined to one country or one people; it has far too many aspects for anyone to presume that he knows all, and each country and each people, if they are true to themselves, have to find out their path themselves, through trial and error, through suffering and experience. Only then do they grow. If they merely copy others, the result is likely to be that they will not grow. And even though the copy may be completely good, it will be something undertaken by them without a normal growth of the mind which really makes it an organic part of themselves.

Our development in the past thirty years or so has been under Mahatma Gandhi. Apart from what he did for us or did not do, the development of this country under his leadership was organic. It was something which fitted in with the spirit and thinking of India. Yet it was not isolated from the modern world, and we fitted in with the modern world. This process of adaptation will go on. It is something which

grows out of the mind and spirit of India, though it is affected by our learning many things from outside. Likewise, this idea of Panchsheel lays down the very important truth that each people must ultimately fend for itself. I am not thinking in terms of military fending, but in terms of striving intellectually, morally, spiritually, and in terms of opening out all our windows to ideas from others, and learning from the experience of others. Each country should look upon such an endeavour on the part of the other with sympathy and friendly understanding and without any interference or imposition.

This is the role India has played. However little has been this role, during these past few years the general policy which we have sought to follow to the best of our ability has been progressively recognized in other countries. It may not have been accepted by all, certainly not; some have disagreed with some parts of it or even the whole of it. But progressively there has been a belief in the integrity of the policy of India. There has been recognition that it is a sincere policy based essentially on goodwill and fellowship with other countries, with no ill will for any country.

GUESTS FROM MOSCOW

OUR DISTINGUISHED GUESTS from the Soviet Union have been in Delhi now for two and a half days. During this brief period they have witnessed the extraordinary welcome that the people of this city have given them. For me to say anything here to add to that welcome will be superfluous, for our people have spoken in a clear voice and we are but the representatives of our people. Nevertheless, I should like to extend on behalf of myself and our Government our warmest welcome to Mr. Bulganin and Mr. Khrushchev and our other guests from the Soviet Union.

Substance of a speech in Hindi at Banquet in honour of Mr. Bulganin and Mr. Khrushchev at Rashtrapati Bhavan, November 20, 1955

This is not a mere formal matter of welcome. Events have demonstrated that there is a deeper friendship and understanding between the peoples of our two great countries which are more significant than the formality of welcome. That understanding and friendship have progressively grown, even though the paths we have pursued in our respective countries have varied. But in spite of this difference of approach in dealing with our problems, which was inevitable in the circumstances which conditioned our countries and our peoples, there has been no element of conflict between us and there has been an approach to each other in many important fields of human activity. I am happy that this is so, and I hope it will be so in the future. We are neighbour countries and it is right that there should be a feeling of neighbourliness and friendship between us for the mutual advantage of both our countries and our peoples. I believe also that this friendship is good for the larger causes of the world and, more particularly for the most vital cause of all, the peace of the world.

We in India have been conditioned by our heritage and by our great leaders as well as by the peaceful methods we adopted in our struggle for freedom. Much more so, therefore, do we believe in world peace and co-operation. Indeed, for us, as for many other countries, this is a matter of the most vital significance. For, if war descends upon the world with all its horror and terrible diasaster, then the great tasks we have undertaken in building up our country will come to an end.

It is only eight years since we became sovereign and independent and these eight years have been spent by us in facing, with all our strength, the manifold problems that confront us. They are great problems, for they involve the future well-being of 370 million people who have suffered for long from poverty. We are confident that we can solve these problems and build up a socialist structure of society in our country giving opportunities of well-being and progress to every single individual. But we know that the task is hard and takes time. Nevertheless, no task is too hard for a people determined to succeed. We are so determined and we have faith in our people.

We believe not only that the ends to be achieved should be good, but also that the means employed should be good, or else new problems arise and the objective itself changes. We believe also that the great cause of human progress cannot be served through violence and hatred and that it is only through friendly and co-operative endeavour that the problems of the world can be solved. Hence, our hand of friendship is stretched out to every nation and every people.

We welcome the co-operation and friendly assistance of other countries. But we realize that a nation develops by its own labours and by its own strength. It was by relying upon ourselves that we gained independence and it is by doing so that we hope to advance to the new objectives that we have placed before ourselves. We are not strong in a military sense or in the world's goods, but we are strong in our faith in our people. In this world of fear and apprehension, I should like to say, with all humility, we are not afraid. Why should we be afraid when our people have faith in themselves?

We have no ambitions against any other country or people. We wish them all well and we are anxious that freedom and social and economic progress should come to all countries. The denial of this freedom, as well as the prevalence of racial discrimination, are not only improper, but are the seeds from which grows the evil tree of conflict and war.

We do not presume to advise others, but we are convinced that it is not by military pacts and alliances and by the piling up of armaments that world peace and security can be attained. Not being military-minded, we do not appreciate the use of military phraseology or military approaches in considering the problems of today. There are talks of cold war and rival camps and groupings and military blocs and alliances, all in the name of peace. We are in no camp and in no military alliance. The only camp we should like to be in is the camp of peace and goodwill which should include as many countries as possible and which should be opposed to none. The only alliance we seek is an alliance based on goodwill and co-operation. If peace is sought after, it has to be by the methods of peace and the language of peace and goodwill.

It was my privilege, as you know, to visit the Soviet Union and to receive warm and affectionate welcome there. I should like to express my deep gratitude to your Excellencies and to the people of the Soviet Union for their affection which went far beyond any formality. I saw in the Soviet Union mighty tasks undertaken and many accomplished for the well-being of the people. I saw, above all, the urgent and widespread desire for peace. With this great work and this vital urge I felt in tune and I saw that the field of co-operation between our two countries was rich and wide. Your Excellencies' visit to India will undoubtedly help in this process of a deeper understanding and co-operation. It is therefore doubly welcome.

I earnestly trust that your visit here will help the great cause of peace and co-operation for which all of us stand and that you will see for yourselves how the people of India are devoting themselves not only to their own betterment but to the wider cause of human advancement.

I should like your Excellencies to convey to your Government and your great people our greetings and message of goodwill and co-operation.

COMMONWEALTH CITIZENSHIP

I WISH TO DEAL with only one aspect of this Bill on which some comments and criticisms have been made. The other aspects will be dealt with by my colleague, the Deputy Minister. This aspect is in regard to the references in this Bill to Commonwealth citizenship. They are in clause 2(1)(c), clause 5(1)(e), clauses 11 and 12 and the First Schedule.

I do not wish to discuss at any length the whole question of the Commonwealth relationship though I shall refer to it briefly. I should like to refer, first of all, to certain statements made in the minute of dissent of some hon. Members to the

effect that there are, because of this relationship, obligations on us which are irksome, repugnant and derogatory. I do not think that it is a correct statement. I speak now not theoretically, but from the experience of the last few years. I should like the hon. Members who have put in this minute of dissent to point out anything that has limited in the slightest our independent sovereign status or freedom of action, internal or external. I submit that there has been no such thing, and that in fact, we have exercised, because of it, a certain greater freedom of action in regard to external matters than we might perhaps have done.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY : May I know whether the hon. Prime Minister is aware that in the British Nationality Act we are considered British subjects?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : I am not aware of that. I think if the hon. Member will read it, he will see it is not quite so. But what the British Nationality Act may or may not say is totally immaterial. It is what we say that counts.

This House knows and the country knows that in regard to our internal and external policies we have functioned exactly as this House and the Government want to. The Commonwealth relationship does not come in our way in the slightest. We have often differed from the policies and practice of the other Commonwealth countries. We have discussed with them and differed. Only recently—and this matter, no doubt, will have larger consequences—there was the pact which is called the Baghdad Pact, which, we think, is a most unfortunate and deplorable action on the part of the countries who have joined it, deplorable not from our point of view, but from the point of view of peace and security. Though such action is taken, it has not affected our policy. On the other hand, I do think that our association in the Commonwealth has been of great help to the larger cause of peace and co-operation. I have no doubt that it has been so. I do not wish to take the time of the House in detailing this. But that is the clear conclusion that I have come to.

We would like to extend that area of co-operation to other countries too. I would mention Burma. With Burma our relations are of the closest, closer than with many Common-

wealth countries. But the fact remains that Burma is not in the Commonwealth. We develop these close relations with other countries. It is asked why Burma has not been mentioned here. For the simple reason that there is a clause of reciprocity. It is not enough if we decide; the other country must also decide on reciprocal facilities. There are various difficulties in regard to the laws of Burma. They have some laws which do not fit in with ours. I should like this House, first of all, to keep in mind that by this Commonwealth relationship, there has been nothing which has come in the way of our dignity, prestige or freedom of action.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE : Could we not make a gesture to Burma for reciprocal rights of citizenship as far as our citizenship law is concerned at present?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : I am perfectly prepared to discuss this with the Government of Burma. The hon. Member will realize that in this matter it is not we that might perhaps dislike any such approach. It may be embarrassing to the other Government. We do not wish to embarrass the other Government. We on our part are perfectly willing, but cannot say anything more in this matter, because we are a country with a large population which tends to expand. Burma is a country with a relatively limited population. For obvious reasons, they do not like to have a large population coming into their country. It is entirely for them to consider : not for us. I would be very glad indeed to consider this matter in connection with Burma.

SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY : But does South Africa like our giving them reciprocity? We are extending the citizenship rights to South Africa.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : We are not.

SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTTY : Because that is a part of the Commonwealth.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : I beg your pardon. We are not. All that you can say is that we are prepared to offer reciprocal rights to any country provided they behave. That is all.

SHRI N. C. CHATTERJEE : If the hon. Prime Minister is correct when he says that we are not giving any reciprocal

rights with regard to the Union of South Africa, why does he not agree to the deletion of the Union of South Africa from the First Schedule?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : I hope that we are gradually working up to a stage when there will be world citizenship. That is a larger matter. Meanwhile, we have to have citizenship laws.

In the course of the development of our Constitution, we had, the House will remember, a period before we became a Republic when we were called a Dominion. Of course, we had long decided to change that status and become an independent Republic. It took two or three years for us to frame our Constitution. Then we became an independent, sovereign Republic owing allegiance to no other authority, even nominally. This question of the Republic coming into the Commonwealth was a completely new conception from the point of view of the Commonwealth, because the Commonwealth till then was based on some kind of allegiance to the sovereign of the United Kingdom. Whether it could be fitted in or not nobody knew at that time, and so far as we were concerned, we rather doubted it. We did not know how it could be fitted in, but we certainly desired, for a number of reasons of vital import, to continue our association. We thought that that would be good for ourselves and for world peace. This was discussed at some length in the years 1948 and 1949 between us and the British Government and the other Commonwealth Governments, and ultimately in the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference. It was their suggestion, and their desire, that there should be some kind of notional, nominal link.

SHRI H.V. KAMATH : Sentimental?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : Not sentimental. There is no sentiment about it, but it is the other way. It is a notion which enables us to hold together, to meet and so on, and after much thought the only way discovered was that the British Government should introduce some clause in their Nationality Bill to enable this association on the basis of reciprocity.

There was no commitment, but certainly there was a

measure of agreement. We told them we were prepared at the right time to include in our Nationality Bill some reference or enabling clause, so that, on the basis of reciprocity, we could give the same treatment which we got in the other country. It is not a uniform thing for all Commonwealth countries. It depends on the reciprocal arrangement we have with that other Commonwealth country. In regard to the United Kingdom, the privileges that Indian nationals have there are very great. In fact, they have almost all the privileges that the British people themselves have. In regard to other countries the privileges are more limited. In regard to South Africa, far from any reciprocity or privileges, there is, if I may use the word, hostility between the two countries. The giving of privileges is entirely an enabling measure; it is entirely in our power to give or not to give. I am presently going to propose a small amendment, which I think the House will probably approve, in regard to this particular matter of South Africa.

I can very well understand the sentiment and desire of the House against including the name of the Union of South Africa in such a Bill. But I would submit that our including the Union of South Africa is not at all to our discredit. What do we say? We are merely enumerating certain countries which for the present are in the Commonwealth, and we are saying that we will give them certain privileges if they behave. Today, no South African can come to India. Leave out the question of Commonwealth citizenship; according to the rules we have framed at present, no South African can enter India. No South African goods can come to India. We are completely cut off from each other. Only by a special permit can a South African come here, and they have been very rarely issued, for some humanitarian work. But I think it is not quite fitting for us to cut out the name of South Africa from the Schedule. The Schedule simply means that we are prepared always to open the door for any compromise if the others behave. That has been our policy in regard to every matter. We are always ready, without giving up our policy or any basic principles, to treat with the other party and negotiate a settlement, however hostile it might be for the

present. That applies to the large world questions too. If a country is hostile to another and both take up an attitude of refusing to deal with each other, then there is no solution left except conflict. Therefore we should never finally close the door.

So far as this Bill is concerned, it is true, and I myself share the sentiment, that it slightly hurts me even to mention South Africa in this connection. Nevertheless, I think for wider reasons it would not be right for us to delete one country.

Then, the whole Commonwealth conception has been obviously a changing one, and it took a tremendous leap in a particular direction of change when an independent Republic owing no allegiance to any outside authority was associated with the Commonwealth.

There are two or three factors which I should like the House to bear in mind. The first thing is that there are many millions of Indians abroad, in what are called the British colonies today, and which, I hope, will cease to be British colonies and will advance to freedom. There is no doubt that our Commonwealth connection helps us and helps them. Otherwise, all these millions of Indians would have to choose either to become absolute aliens in the country where they are living or to give up completely their connection with India. Of course, when a country becomes independent, like Ceylon or Burma, they have to choose, but forcing them to choose before they are independent puts them into a very embarrassing and false position. I do not think it is right that we should place these millions of our fellow-countrymen in that position.

Then also, look at the question from the point of view of the likely development of the Commonwealth. I hope that in the course of the next year there will be an addition to the Commonwealth, the Gold Coast. That will be a good thing, and we are looking forward to it greatly. The addition of the Gold Coast again changes the entire character of this association of nations. Here is a full-blooded African nation for the first time being associated in this way. So the European character of the Commonwealth changes. As it is, there are free Asian and African nations coming together and I hope

that subsequent steps will bring in perhaps Singapore and Malaya. It is good for the world and good for race relations if these changes take place. It may be that some members of the Commonwealth, notably the Union of South Africa, utterly dislike this change, because it goes against their basic policy. Well, they have to face their difficulty, and not we. I should like to place the burden of choice on them. They might so disapprove of these developments as not to tolerate them, and retire into their own shells, cut off from the rest of the world. But why should I not have the widest sphere of influence and co-operation?

I submit that from these wider points of view, it is desirable for us, more especially at the present day when these big questions arise, to have this Commonwealth link and association and thereby help in the larger cause of peace. India can be influenced by other countries, but it should be remembered that India also can influence other countries, and has done so to a remarkable extent in the past few years.

I would therefore beg this House to accept this broad pattern which, I again say, does not give the slightest privilege or special position to any country except on a basis of reciprocity. It is an enabling measure. There is one amendment, however, which I would like to suggest for the approval of the House. If Members will refer to clause 2(c) of the Bill, they will find the following :

“ ‘citizenship or nationality law’ in relation to a country specified in the First Schedule means an enactment of the legislature of that country, which at the request of the Government of that country the Central Government may, by notification in the Official Gazette, have declared to be an enactment making provision for the citizenship of nationality of that country;”

This is an enabling clause. But I would like to add to this the following :

“Provided that in respect of the Union of South Africa, no such notification shall be issued except with the approval of both Houses of Parliament.”

That, first of all, is an indication of the special way we look at the Union of South Africa in this connection. Secondly, we want in this matter to bring every step to both Houses of

Parliament and not leave it to Government. I submit that if this proviso is added, some part at least of the sentiment we feel in this matter is met, and the broad advantages of the position will also be maintained.

NEW TRENDS IN RUSSIA

I SHOULD LIKE to take this opportunity of drawing the attention of the House to a very important event in recent weeks. I refer to the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union which met recently in Moscow. There can be no doubt that this Congress has adopted a new line and a new policy. This new line, both in political thinking and in practical policy, appears to be based upon a more realistic appreciation of the present world situation and represents a significant process of adaptation and adjustment. According to our principles we do not interfere in the internal affairs of other countries, just as we do not welcome any interference of others in our country. But any important development in any country which appears to be a step towards the creation of conditions favourable to the pursuit of a policy of peaceful coexistence is important for us as well as others. It is for this reason that we feel that the decisions of the Twentieth Congress of the Soviet Union are likely to have far-reaching effects. I hope that this development will lead to a further relaxation of tension in the world.

THE BAGHDAD PACT

A FEW WORDS about the Baghdad Pact and SEATO. It is clear that the approach of military pacts, like the Baghdad Pact and SEATO, is a wrong approach, a dangerous approach and a harmful approach. It sets in motion all the wrong tendencies and prevents the right tendencies from developing. When the pacts are bad in themselves it is a matter of little consequence whether you suspect any country participating in these pacts of dishonesty or lack of *bona fides*. Moreover, the SEATO and Baghdad Pacts, apart from being basically in the wrong direction, affect us intimately. In a sense, they tend to encircle us.

As the House knows, the Baghdad Pact has in fact created in Western Asia far greater tension and conflict than ever before. It has certainly put one country against another among countries that were friendly to one another. I do not know how anyone can say that this has brought security and stability to Western Asia.

Hon. Members know that the Baghdad Pact is said to be the northern or middle tier of defence, and presumably it is meant for defence against aggression if it takes place from the Soviet Union. I cannot guarantee which country will commit aggression and which will not. Every great and powerful country tends to expand and to be somewhat aggressive. It is very difficult for a giant not to function sometimes as a giant. One can guard oneself as much as possible. One can create an atmosphere in which the giant will function mildly, but it is inherent in a giant's strength to act like a giant if he does not like something. That is true of whichever giant of the world you might have in mind. But, surely, nobody here imagines that the Pakistan Government entered into this Pact because it expected some imminent or distant invasion or aggression from the Soviet Union? The Pakistan newspapers and the statements of responsible people in Pakistan make it perfectly clear that they have joined this Pact because of India. Either they are apprehensive of India, or they want to

develop strength and, as the phrase now goes, speak from strength. Whatever it is, they have joined the Baghdad Pact and SEATO essentially because of their hostility to India. I am sorry, because I do not feel hostility towards them and I cannot conceive of a war with Pakistan without the utmost dismay. My point is that people enter into these pacts with different motives. I am quite sure that the other members of the Baghdad Pact have no hostility to India, even as I am equally sure that India was the motive of Pakistan when it entered into this Pact. I am prepared to accept completely the assurance given to me by the leaders of the United States of America. I am quite sure they did not mean ill to us. They probably did not even think of India in this connection. Their minds were elsewhere, on the northern, western and middle tiers of defence. But the effect is the same: one gets tied up and interlocked. Countries get interlocked with one another, each pulls in a different direction and in a crisis they are pulled away in a direction they never thought of going.

Look at the series of alliances and military pacts in the whole region of South-East and Eastern Asia. It is almost as bad, I must say, as the big international trusts and combines. We do not quite know who is pulling where. Things are happening for which nobody appears to be responsible. The danger is that any odd member of one of these pacts can set in motion something which would gradually pull in not only the members of that pact, but some other interrelated pact of which they are common members. That is why, both for larger reasons and for the narrow reason of self-interest, we have taken exception to the SEATO and Baghdad Pacts. We think that they push the world in a wrong direction. They do not recognize the new factors that are at work. Instead of taking advantage of these new factors which go towards peace, disarmament and the lessening of tension, they deliberately check them and encourage other tendencies which increase hatred and fear and apprehension and come in the way of disarmament.

EVENTS IN HUNGARY AND EGYPT

ONLY RECENTLY we had reports of deportation by the Soviet authorities of people from Hungary, specially young men. The Hungarian Government has denied this in the United Nations. So has the Soviet Government. I believe even today a resolution has been placed before the General Assembly on this subject, based on the newspaper reports which are denied by the two Governments which are apparently the most concerned and which should know. It becomes extraordinarily difficult for anyone to come to a conclusion without further information or further enquiry into the matter. In fact, I believe it was stated in the General Assembly on behalf of the Hungarian Government that they not only categorically denied this but that they had taken steps to allow some representatives of the workers, young men and others, to go and sit at the various points of exit from Hungary and to see for themselves if anything was being done there or anybody was being sent away. It is quite conceivable—it is only a guess—that these young men or workers were being sent to see things for themselves, and it might have been thought that they were being deported. I do not know; I am merely pointing out the difficulty of getting a correct picture.

In regard to Egypt, as the House knows, we in India have been intimately associated with events during the last few months. To begin with, even our relations with Egypt are intimate, and we are in constant touch with what happens there. Ever since the nationalization of the Suez Canal, we were in very intimate touch, so that what happened did not come to us as a surprise. We were in a much better position to judge that situation. It was an open situation at that time. Things that have later happened in Egypt are rather confusing, for example, the state of affairs at Port Said and so on. But the broad facts were clear to us and therefore we ventured to express a very clear and definite opinion about them.

In regard to Hungary, the difficulty was that the broad facts were not clear to us. Also the occurrences in Hungary

Speech in Lok Sabha during debate on Foreign Affairs,
November 19, 1956

took place at a moment when suddenly the international situation became very much worse and we had to be a little surer and clearer as to what had actually happened and what the present position was. Therefore, we were a little cautious in the expression of our opinion in regard to facts, though not in regard to general principles that should govern conditions there. As the House knows, right from the very beginning we made it perfectly clear that in regard to Hungary or Egypt or anywhere else, any kind of suppression by violent elements of the freedom of the people was an outrage on liberty. I said that and I made it perfectly clear, first, that foreign forces should be removed both from Egypt and Hungary, although the two cases are not parallel; and secondly, that the people of Hungary should be given the opportunity to determine their future.

I believe even now facilities are not being given both in Hungary and in parts of Egypt occupied by foreign forces, like Port Said, and the other parts occupied by the Israeli Army, for outsiders to go there. On the last occasion I said in this House that from the reports we had received, conditions in Port Said were very bad and that casualties were heavy. The statement I made was cautious. The reports which we had received were much worse than what I had said, but because I did not wish to proceed on those reports without further confirmation, I moderated my language in describing it. The fact is that even up to now, so far as I know, nobody is allowed to go into Port Said. The reports that came to us previously were partly from refugees. We do not usually attach very great importance to statements of excited refugees—not that they deliberately misrepresent, but they are emotionally wound up and they tend not to give a correct appraisal of events. The reports that came to us about the events in Port Said were from some foreign journalists who had gone to Port Said at the peril of their lives and who had made these statements in foreign papers in Europe. Even so, we hesitated to accept them because they were so bad that we thought they should be confirmed. In fact, we have been suggesting in the case of Egypt, as in the case of Hungary, that it is desirable from every point of view, even from the point of

view of the occupying forces, that impartial observers, preferably sent by the United Nations, should go, look at the things there and report. I earnestly trust that the Governments or the authorities concerned in both places will permit this to be done, because otherwise all kinds of wild reports are circulated and believed in.

We have been receiving fairly full accounts in dispatches from our Embassies and Missions abroad. Almost daily we get these reports from New York, from Washington, from London, from Moscow, from Belgrade, from Cairo, Beirut, Damascus, Berne and some other places, and from Vienna and Budapest also, because we have had one of our young officers in Budapest throughout this period. It is true that he could not communicate with us easily and his telegrams usually reach us now about six days late because they have had to go to Vienna presumably by road and then they are dispatched from Vienna. All this daily information that we get not only from our Missions but by the courtesy of other Governments—more especially the Governments of the United States, Canada, the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia and some other Governments—has resulted in an abundance which is often contradictory. I will say it gives a very confused picture, but it is true, I think, that one can make a fair appraisal of these events. May I just say that I should like to express my appreciation of the work done by our Ambassador in Cairo which has been of a high order?

So far as the situation in Egypt is concerned, the House knows that the first contingent of our forces has already gone there. Others will follow. I want to make it perfectly clear on what conditions we sent these forces to join the United Nations Force. First of all, we made it clear that it was only if the Government of Egypt agreed that we would send them; secondly, they were not to be considered in any sense a continuing force continuing the activities of the Anglo-French forces, but an entirely separate thing; thirdly, that the Anglo-French forces should be withdrawn; fourthly, that the United Nations Force should function to protect the old armistice line between Israel and Egypt; and finally, that it would be a temporary affair. We are not prepared to agree to

our force or any force remaining there indefinitely. It was on these conditions, which were accepted, that these forces were sent there. I repeat this because, unfortunately, statements are sometimes made about this United Nations International Force which are not in consonance with the decision of the United Nations or, I believe, with the agreements arrived at by the Secretary-General of the United Nations with the Egyptian Government.

Then, the first question that arises in Egypt at the present moment in regard to the resolution of the United Nations General Assembly is that of the withdrawal of the Anglo-French and the Israeli forces from Egyptian territory. This is a dangerous issue because if there is any attempt to create delay, and certainly if there is any attempt not to withdraw, there is likely to be a resumption of hostilities which, I think, will be on a bigger scale than earlier.

It is stated—and I believe on fairly good authority—that some days ago there was some addition to these forces. But I cannot say for certain. It is a vital matter however that Anglo-French and Israeli forces should withdraw from the area they have occupied because without that nothing else can be got going and so long as they remain, there will be constant fear of hostilities being resumed.

I have already referred to certain reports about Port Said which require immediate attention and which can only be done properly by observers being allowed to go there and report. The House may know that we are sending—I think tomorrow—a very large plane-load, in size about three Dakotas, of medical supplies and relief goods which are being taken both to Egypt and to Hungary.

In Hungary, as I said, the conditions, especially the rather detailed developments, were for some time not at all clear to us. I am not quite sure if they are completely clear even now; but I think the broad facts are clear enough. There is little doubt that the kind of nationalist uprising which took place there developed after conflict with the Soviet forces there. The Soviet forces were withdrawn from Budapest and a statement was issued on October 30, embodying the Soviet policy in regard to these countries, which stated that they

would withdraw their forces after consulting the Warsaw Powers.

It is a fact, I think, that they were withdrawn. But, very soon after, other events occurred in Budapest—and this matter is not quite clear, but I think not only in Budapest but in all Hungary—and within three or four days the Soviet forces returned and in far greater mechanized power. There were big conflicts in Budapest which were ultimately suppressed by the Soviet armed forces. Some people say that even while the Soviet forces were withdrawing from Budapest round about October 29 or 30, actually the Soviet Army had come across the frontier and that it was not—if I may use that word—a *bona fide* withdrawal at all. Others think that something happened in the course of those two or three days which made the Soviet Government change its policy, because we must remember that before any Government does that, more especially the Soviet Government or the British Government or any major Power, all these separate questions are weighed presumably in the light of other international developments and the possibility of a bigger flare-up. That is always in their mind. Anyhow, the fact remains that the Soviet forces came back and there was a major conflict in which a fairly large number of Hungarians suffered as they fought very bravely. It is possible that the Hungarian Army itself was on the side of the Hungarian people and in the initial stages the Soviets also suffered fairly considerably, though, naturally, in lesser numbers. It is not at the present moment of any very great importance that we should know the details of this. The major fact stands out that the majority of the people of Hungary wanted a change, political, economic or whatever else, and demonstrated and actually rose in insurrection to achieve it but ultimately they were suppressed.

I think it is true that there were some elements on the side of the Hungarians which might be called by a word which is rather misused sometimes, "Fascist". I think it is true that outsiders also came in because the border forces were not functioning. And I think it is also true that arms came from outside to some extent. But while all that is true, that is not the major fact. The major fact is that the people of Hungary,

a very large part of them, claimed freedom from outside control and interference, objected to the Soviet forces coming, wanted them to withdraw and wanted some internal changes in their Government. That is a basic fact which nobody can deny.

Another rather implicit feature of the situation, perhaps more significant than even the fighting that the Hungarian people indulged in, is the fact that when fighting stopped—it stopped some days ago, I think they are not fighting now, certainly in Budapest if not in all Hungary—there was rather an extraordinary demonstration of passive resistance. That is, the people of Budapest refused to go back to work and refused to take part in other normal activities at a time when the city was suffering very greatly by the stoppage of work during the period of armed conflict. This resistance of the people in a peaceful and passive way seemed to be, so far as I am concerned, more significant of the wishes of their country than an armed revolt.

I wonder how many of the hon. Members present here have in mind the past history of Hungary. It is a rather tragic history, with frequent attempts to attain freedom frequently suppressed. During the regime of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, there were many such attempts. We know well what we were told nearly forty years ago, when we in this country first had this picture of non-cooperation put before us by Mahatma Gandhi; and we read about the non-cooperation or something like it in other countries. Among those countries, more especially, was Hungary, where sometime in the middle of the nineteenth century, a movement of non-cooperation and passive resistance arose which achieved some objectives though not completely. Again, five weeks before the First World War ended, just after the October Revolution, there was an upheaval in Hungary. Austro-Hungary was breaking up; the German armies had been there and they were withdrawing and there was an upheaval more or less on the lines of the upheaval in Russia at the time. The leader of that was one Bela Kun, an associate of Lenin, and he established the Republic of Hungary. That was a time of intervention by other foreign countries in

the affairs of the Soviet Union after the Revolution. The Rumanian Army marched into Hungary then, and suppressed this new Republic of Hungary, and suppressed it, so far as I can remember, in an exceedingly ruthless manner. In fact, it was not merely a suppression of the Republic, but widespread loot of Hungary by these armies. As a result of that, the Republic ceased to be and a regime was established under Admiral Horthy, which was a kind of feudal regime. Hon. Members may perhaps remember that Hungary has been in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries one of the most feudal countries in Europe, with very large landholders and outdated aristocracy. There was conflict between the various groups. I had a glimpse of Admiral Horthy's regime in 1928 when I happened to be in Budapest: It was not a very satisfying spectacle. Then came the big war. I mention all this to bring to the mind of the House the tragic history of Hungary. There are many names connected with Hungary which are famous in the fight for freedom of peoples. There is little doubt that the present movement in Hungary was a popular one; it was a movement with the great mass of the people behind it, the workers and the young people especially. This, as I said, became even more patent by the passive resistance of the people in spite of the heavy armed strength against them.

The first thing, as I said, is that observers should go to Port Said and other parts of Egypt which are occupied by foreign forces, and to Budapest and other parts of Hungary. Their mere visit will bring out facts. Not only that. They will be opening a window through which the world can look in and find out what has happened and what is happening.

We want foreign forces to be withdrawn from Egypt as well as Hungary. We must also remember that there are certain dangers in the situation, not so much in Egypt, where there is a Government, but in Hungary. The House knows that during the last year or two, there have been certain currents and motions in Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union itself, which have to some extent liberalized the functioning of the regimes there. In Poland this went perhaps further than in other places, but the same ferment has been

apparent in all countries. If anything is done which comes in the way of this internal and organic process of change, which may well have the opposite effect to that intended, then it becomes tied up with the larger issues of war and peace. What do we see behind these issues? Fear, fear of the Western Powers, fear of the Soviet Union, and even more so, fear of the possible armed might of rearmed Germany. All over Eastern Europe, whether it is Poland or Hungary or Czechoslovakia and those countries which have repeatedly suffered invasion from the German side, there is this fear of an armed Germany. The fear of Western countries regarding the armed might of the Soviet Union brought into existence pacts and alliances like the NATO, SEATO, and the Baghdad Pact. Then came into existence, as a counterblast, the Warsaw Treaty. Each of these systems of alliances pretends to be an association for peace and defence against attack, but each has the effect really of frightening the other party and making it more apprehensive of danger and, therefore, quickening the race of armaments.

Because of this background, when about three weeks ago the Anglo-French forces bombed Cairo, there was immediate danger of the conflict spreading. The Hungarian situation arose, and the two, taken together, definitely added greatly to this danger. Hon. Members will see that it is not my intention in the present speech to go about condemning countries. Not that their acts are not worthy of condemnation, but the fact is that each group is attempting to lay stress on what has happened in the other place so as to hide its own misdemeanour. There was the Anglo-French action in Egypt and there was a world outcry against it in the United Nations. Then came Hungary. Bad enough. But immediately it was made use of to hide what was happening in Egypt. The struggle in Hungary was represented as the basic thing so as somehow to cover up the misdeeds in Egypt.

Now, I do not mean for an instant to say that we are nobler or higher or purer than other countries. But we happen to be in a position which, to some extent, helps us not to get so frightfully excited about one side or the other and therefore we can view these events a little more objectively, perhaps.

The House will know that only yesterday Premier Bulganin issued an appeal. I received a letter from him containing some proposals for a conference to consider the world situation and more especially disarmament. The various proposals have been examined and there is no doubt that disarmament is of high importance, more especially in this context. The question whether there should be a conference or not and whether this question of disarmament will be considered there will really be decided by the Big Powers. We do not have a large army to disarm. But if we can be of any help in this business, naturally our services will be available.

I should like the House to look below the surface of things and into the deeper changes. First of all, we see this brutal exercise of violence and armed might against weaker countries. *Prima facie*, this appears to be the triumph of violence and armed might and this puts every militarily weak country in peril and its independence in danger. Every country in Asia and Africa must particularly feel this danger. But there is another aspect, and that is that the exhibition of violence and armed might has failed or is going to fail. It has created great damage, great suffering and great bitterness, but in the final analysis it has failed or, I think, is likely to fail in achieving its aim. Take the aggression in Egypt. I think it is fairly clear that the United Kingdom and France have not gained anything and are not going to gain anything; they will lose much. Apart from the fact that Egypt has suffered very greatly, the United Kingdom and France have also suffered, not in human lives so much—although even the loss of human life has been considerable on the Anglo-French side because of the round-about fight and parachute-landing and so on. There are the very heavy financial losses which are going to continue and which will upset these countries' economies. The results of this adventure in Egypt are going to be very serious and will probably last a long time.

It is said that this operation prevented the Russians from coming into the Middle East. I confess I do not see how it has done that. It has, in fact, possibly opened the door through which they might come in future, just as the Baghdad Pact, which was meant to protect the Middle East from the Soviet

Union, really resulted in the Soviet Union taking far greater interest in the Middle East than they had done previously. This argument that the aggression in Egypt has succeeded in keeping the Russians away is not proved at all. In fact, I think, it has made it easier for the Middle East to become the possible scene of a major conflict. Thus England and France are likely to lose more than Egypt has suffered.

Let us look at the other problem—that of Hungary and the Soviet Union. There was no immediate aggression there in the sense of something militarily happening as there was in the case of Egypt. It was really a continuing intervention of the Soviet armies in these countries, based on the Warsaw Pact. I am not very much concerned about the legal implications of the Warsaw Pact. It may be that some lawyers may say that strictly in terms of the Warsaw Pact the Soviet army had a right to be there. But that is a very small matter. The fact is, as subsequent events have shown, the Soviet armies were there against the wishes of the Hungarian people. That is clear.

Any other explanation is not adequate. It is true that the great force of the Soviet Union triumphed in the military way in Budapest and Hungary. But at what cost? I have no doubt in my mind that sooner or later the Hungarian people, who have demonstrated so vividly their desire for freedom and for a separate identity in which they are not overshadowed by any other country, are bound to triumph.

Apart from that, we must realize that all these events have powerfully affected the prestige of the Soviet Union not only in the many countries which are supposed to be uncommitted countries, but more among countries and governments which are on the side of that country, including, if I may say so, the people of the Soviet Union itself. The respect that a country, its government and its policy have is a much more precious commodity than anything else. We see today that the events in Egypt and Hungary have set the Soviet Union, England, the countries of Europe and America, and certainly the Asian and African countries thinking. They are all trying to understand what has happened and to find out what they should do. Even those people who are intimately tied up with

one particular policy, and with one particular bloc of countries, are not clear in their minds whether that policy was the correct one. Two or three years ago, certain new trends displayed themselves and affected the life and activities of the Soviet Union and later the East European countries. But we have seen that the progress made was too slow in the East European countries and they wanted it to be more rapid. This created a difficulty for the Soviet Union, resulting in this conflict. Whether this conflict will lead to a greater liberalization on the part of the Soviet Union or the reverse I cannot say. I would have been clear in my mind but for this complicated international situation. But, as I just said, I have no doubt that forces have been set in motion in all these countries among the rulers and among the common people which make people think on somewhat different lines. They will realize, I believe, that they have been going along wrong lines. Where have all these systems of pacts and alliances led them? Not to peace or security, but to trouble. What is the position now of the Baghdad Pact? You may talk about the Baghdad Pact, but everybody knows that the Baghdad Pact is dead and it has absolutely no life left in it. What the SEATO alliance is doing I do not know, but we have not heard of it for a long time—it may be in a dormant condition. As for the Warsaw Treaty we see the effect of it and the reaction to it in the East European countries. It may continue in form, but it has lost its content.

Regarding NATO we have seen the differences among the Powers included in NATO. It has ceased to be, if it was so earlier, a kind of spiritual crusade. Both camps have lost that spirit of crusade. They have only become some paper arrangements. They certainly have the armed forces but they now lack the spirit which had perhaps given them some meaning previously.

We have arrived at a stage where the use of armed forces by the big countries, while apparently achieving something, has really shown its inability to deal with the situation. In people's minds violence has been shown up, and the ferment is bound to continue working. I earnestly hope that as a result of all this we may survive this crisis and then take further

steps towards disarmament and towards putting an end to all these military alliances which have proved so worthless.

We have ideologies like communism and other 'isms' which people, often people of great merit and integrity, have pursued in a crusading way. There is no doubt that the appeal of communism affected large numbers of young men in varying degrees. Even though communism has gradually become somewhat more 'respectable' in people's eyes in the sense that communist governments function as other governments, it bears the aspect of some kind of religion and is often spread by intervention. Whether it is armed intervention or other intervention has depended on circumstances. This kind of intervention has become less and less evident, but it is still there.

The whole basis—not the internal economic system but the international implications—of the country is such as to create apprehensions of intervention in other countries. We have seen many instances of it. The most recent instance is the fact that undoubtedly the Government in Hungary was not a free Government but was an imposed Government, and that the people of Hungary were not satisfied. Ten years have passed since the last war, and if in ten years in Hungary the people could not be converted to that particular theory, it shows a certain failure which is far greater, it seems to me, than the failure of the military coup. It indicates that all of us, whether we are communists or non-communists or anti-communists, have to think afresh. The lesson of Egypt and Hungary for us is that whether the evil is a new one or an old one as in Africa and parts of Asia, if it is based on violence and the suppression of a country and a people by armed force, then it is a bad thing and has to be removed and liquidated. So long as it is not done, it will create trouble and friction and possibly lead to war.

Therefore, apart from the outward features of the present crisis, there is this crisis of conscience, a spiritual crisis almost, in peoples' minds. I hope that mere strong reactions to events will not smother this spiritual crisis. I would submit that it has been shown that any attempt to find a better way of international co-operation cannot, if it has to have any stability,

be based on armed forces being used to suppress people. If that fact is accepted, it means we must have full freedom, whether it is a communist society or an anti-communist society. Once violence and suppression are removed, all these theories have a free field. They can be experimented upon, and we shall learn by the experience of others and adopt such things as we like.

There is one thing more before I finish. I have in view a certain controversy that has arisen in regard to India's voting in the United Nations on a resolution on Hungary. We circulated through the Lok Sabha Secretariat to hon. Members two speeches relating to Hungary delivered by our representative, Shri Krishna Menon, on November 8 and 9. We got them the day before yesterday. A reading of these speeches will give a better idea of their content than any quotation I can give.

I have today got further details of the voting on those days. I would have gladly circulated the telegram, but I got it only this morning. The resolution consists of nine paragraphs. The first five paragraphs are what are called the "preamble"; the next four are called "operative". Now the voting on the resolution was on each separate paragraph. India abstained on all the five paragraphs of the preamble.

In regard to the first part of the preamble the abstentions were : Afghanistan, Austria, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Egypt, Finland, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Yemen, Yugoslavia. In regard to paragraph 1 of the operative part also, India abstained.

SHRI H. V. KAMATH : In view of the Prime Minister's categorical statement now and also, I believe, on Friday that the Government has supported the withdrawal of the Russian forces from Hungary, may I ask whether this abstention from voting on paragraph 1 of the operative part of the Resolution is consistent with Government's stand?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : There were four resolutions on Hungary. India voted in favour of one and abstained on the others. We must read it in the context. When India abstained she stood for withdrawal, but I am for the

moment giving facts regarding the context and the way it was put.

The operative part is :

“Calls upon the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to withdraw its forces from Hungary without any further delay.”

That is one.

The second is :

“Considers that free elections should be held in Hungary under U.N. auspices as soon as law and order have been restored to enable the people of Hungary to determine for themselves the form of government they wish to establish in their country.”

Here separate voting took place on the phrase “under United Nations auspices”. In this voting, India voted against. So also, apart from the other countries mentioned previously, did Ceylon and Yugoslavia. They voted against this phrase “under United Nations auspices”. This was the only thing that India voted against in the whole resolution—the phrase “under United Nations auspices”.

On the remainder of paragraph 2, India abstained and on paragraphs 3 and 4 also she abstained. When finally the resolution was put as a whole with the phrase “under United Nations auspices” India voted against. That is the factual position.

FOREIGN TROOPS IN HUNGARY

MR. CHAIRMAN, I understand that Dr. H. N. Kunzru made some reference yesterday to the reports which we are said to have received from our Ambassador in Hungary. We have not as a matter received his or Shri Khosla's full report yet. We have been informed it is coming by bag. But we have naturally received a number of telegrams almost daily from Shri K. P. S. Menon and previously from Shri

Khosla. It is rather contrary to normal practice for me to place before the House the confidential telegrams that we have received which include the results of talks with the people in authority in Hungary and others. It would be not only contrary to practice but likely to prove embarrassing to the people who have talked to them. I regret I cannot do that. But, broadly speaking, what our Ambassadors have reported to us has really been stated publicly on various occasions, and there is no doubt that the revolution in Hungary was what is called a national one and a widespread one. There were, they said, elements in it which might be called counter-revolutionary or reactionary. There were elements in it which came from outside too. But those formed a small part, and it was essentially a national movement in which the great majority of the industrial workers and students took part in the City of Budapest and elsewhere. That is the basic fact.

This phase of the revolution in Hungary started on October 23, and on October 30 there was conflict in which the Hungarian army also to some extent participated. The House may remember that on October 30 the Soviet Government issued a statement about their general policy not only in Hungary but in other States of Eastern Europe. In it they referred to the Warsaw Treaty under which they kept their forces there, and said that they would withdraw them from Budapest immediately and, as for the rest, after consultation with the Warsaw Powers. It does appear to us and to our Ambassador that that was the position then, and that in fact the Soviet Government did withdraw their troops outside Budapest. Other events happened in Budapest after that and there was a good deal of fighting internally. Just about that time, within a day or two, events took place in Egypt which possibly brought a new factor into consideration. After that initial withdrawal from Budapest there was a return of the Soviet forces in large numbers.

And then took place the other phase of this great tragedy in Budapest. There are various estimates of the people who were killed in these shootings. It is difficult to have any accurate estimate. But from such information as we have

received, it would appear that about 25,000 Hungarians and about 7,000 Russians died in this fighting. The Russians were presumably largely men of the forces. Since then, there has been no big-scale fighting. There have been occasional incidents involving some petty shootings resulting possibly in one or two or three deaths. There has been no major fighting. There has, however, been a considerable measure of passive resistance. Workers have not gone back to work, and then, many of them have gone back to work but worked only to a small extent. It may be of interest to hon. Members here to know that our Ambassador told us that the atmosphere he found in Budapest at this time was reminiscent of the Civil Disobedience days in India. I do not know whether I am right in this matter or not, but a word has come into use in Hungary, especially in Budapest, in connection with the suspension of work. The word is 'kartal'. Whether it is derived from 'hartal', I do not know.

Our special instructions at the time to our Ambassadors, Shri Khosla and Shri Menon, were that they should speak to the Hungarian Government about the visit of the Secretary-General of the United Nations and observers of the United Nations. They have reported about past events. But when there have been developments from day to day, it is more important to know what step to take than to go into the past history, except to understand the situation. They had long talks with the present Prime Minister of Hungary, Mr. Kadar, and with others, and presented our viewpoint with such argument and force as they could. Mr. Kadar informed them that they had no objection to the visit of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, but that it should take place later, with no time fixed. But he took strong exception to the United Nations observers going there, as he considered it an infringement of Hungary's sovereignty.

Our great anxiety, and the anxiety of many other people, in this matter has been that the situation should not be allowed to drift towards war. Naturally, this House and all of us have witnessed the gravest tragedies that have been enacted in Hungary and have the greatest sympathy for the people there. But we have also kept in mind that this tragedy might

be infinitely greater if war should break out not only elsewhere, but in Hungary itself. Therefore, our approach has been to prevent this happening in so far as a country like ours has any weight in the councils of the world. This has been the object of the recent activities of our delegation in the United Nations.

Hon. Members may have seen the resolution that was moved on behalf of India and some other countries and the amendment moved also on our behalf there to the other resolution sponsored by some countries. The major divergences were not in regard to any judgment of the situation in Hungary, but rather the approach. We want the approach to be constructive, so that these difficulties are somehow got over and the result is not only avoidance of war and the establishment of peace and normal conditions, but the withdrawal of foreign forces from Hungary. We thought that such a constructive approach was more important than a merely negative approach which might lead to more dangerous consequences. That is the main difference between these two resolutions—the one put forward by about twenty countries—and the other put forward by India and three other countries.

The latest news is that the resolution put forward by the twenty countries—the United States and others—was passed with one amendment. I think one of our amendments was incorporated in it. It was passed and thereupon our representative did not press our resolution.

I find that the hon. Dr. Kunzru quoted some sentences from the speech of the leader of our delegation in the United Nations and wanted to know whether he was expressing the opinion of the Government of India in this matter. I shall read out a part of the speech as reported in the press. We have not received it independently.

“My Government does not want, in the present context of existing circumstances in the world—although it does not conform to its own policies—to go into the question of withdrawal of foreign forces in the sense of forces which are tied to defence alliances in this context.”

May I explain this? In our opinion, the way to bring about real stability and peace in Europe and in the world

and to put an end to the tensions and the armament race, in fact to endeavour to solve these very grave problems, is the withdrawal of all foreign forces from every country—certainly in Europe. I think the major problems of Europe such as the very important problem of Germany, which is the heart of Central Europe, would be much nearer solution if foreign forces on both sides were removed. It is our opinion and we hold by it. Nevertheless, we did feel that for us to press that opinion at this juncture in Hungary when there was a deep crisis would not be legitimate. That is what Shri Menon has said. That is, although we want such withdrawal, we are not pressing that general proposition at this stage, but are rather pressing the immediate issue of Hungary and the withdrawal of foreign forces from there.

That is why he says :

“My Government does not want, in the present context of existing circumstances in the world—although it does not conform to its own policies—to go into the question of withdrawal of foreign forces in the sense of forces which are tied to defence alliances in this context. We believe the existence of foreign troops in any country is inimical to its freedom, and is a danger to world peace and co-operation. But in the particular circumstances that obtain, there are different alliances ranged one against another.....”

There is NATO, there is the Warsaw Pact, there is the Baghdad Pact and SEATO and so many others :

“.....a policy of power balance which is rapidly pushing this world into a state of war. We are, therefore, judging the situation in the limited context of the use of Soviet forces in regard to internal affairs in Hungary. The only justification, if there was one, would have been for the Soviet forces to have been called to the aid of civil power in conditions where there was an attempt at a *coup d'état*.

“My Government is convinced that the original revolt against the Hungarian regime that existed was a movement of national liberation, by which is meant not national liberation as a colonial country but a movement to overthrow or rather to bring about the kind of changes that are taking place in Eastern Europe.”

Now, as the House will notice, the burden of the argument is that first of all we are not going into these defence alliances, etc., which have prompted foreign troops to be placed in

various countries, though we disagree with these alliances under which one country helps another with troops. In a strictly legal way these alliances may permit foreign troops to be stationed in a country and utilized if there is a *coup d'etat*. But what is a *coup d'etat*? It certainly is not a national uprising, but it means somebody is trying to seize power rather against the nation's wishes. Shri Menon has pointed out that even if one agrees with this, it does not apply to Hungary, because this was a national rising. This is the burden of the argument, a perfectly legitimate argument and an argument which strengthens the main contention that the Soviet forces should be withdrawn from there. The Soviet intervention was not a case of their intervening according to their treaty obligations, because there was no *coup d'etat*. On the other hand there was a national rising. That is the whole burden of the argument. Our position and Shri Menon's position is that foreign troops should not be there at all.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU : May I put a question? Would the Prime Minister mind being interrupted? Would any of the countries that are members of the NATO be justified in a case of serious civil disturbance in asking for the aid of another foreign power which was a member of the NATO?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : So far as I am concerned, that would not at all be justified. That is my whole argument, that the functioning of Soviet troops there was not justified. In fact, when foreign forces are placed in a country, you put them and that country in a very difficult and embarrassing position. The whole thing is unnatural and should not be encouraged.

I would suggest to the hon. Member and other hon. Members to read the full speech of Shri Krishna Menon. It does not appear in all the papers fully. We have not yet received it fully. It has appeared in one newspaper rather extensively. It is a very powerful plea in this matter with which we wish to associate ourselves fully.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU : May I ask for information on one point? The leader of the Indian delegation stated in the course of his speech that the information received here—I quote now—"led India to believe that the one factor which

was preventing the unity of various Hungarian elements was the presence of foreign troops." Another statement made by him is: "The amount of damage to Budapest, India was informed, was on the scale of what would take place in wartime." Is this correct?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The hon. Member is trying to draw me out about the reports of our Ambassador.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Our representative has said it openly.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: It is true that our Ambassador reported to us that the damage in Budapest was heart-rending and it was on the scale of what occurs in wartime. As far as the other statement is concerned, I do not precisely remember what our Ambassador said, but the whole point is this: our position—and I believe the hon. Member's position—is that so long as foreign troops remain there, it is difficult for the local people to come together and function properly. That is quite correct.

INDEPENDENCE OF GHANA

I AM INDEED HAPPY to be present here. I would have been happier if I could be present today at Accra, the capital of Ghana. I wanted to go there very much, but unfortunately elections came in the way and it became impossible for me to leave India. But my mind has been full of this great event which we have met to celebrate. The independence of any country is a thing to be celebrated and welcomed, but there is something more distinctive about the independence of Ghana than perhaps of some other countries. It symbolizes so much for the whole continent of Africa. Africa has had a peculiarly tragic history for hundreds of years. And to see Africa, or an important part of it, turn its face towards dawn after the dark night is indeed something exhilarating. There is therefore

Speech at a meeting organized by the African Students' Association (India) in Delhi, March 6, 1957

about this event today something of the break of dawn. It moves us not only intellectually but emotionally.

Unfortunately, not many people are acquainted with the past of Africa. I confess that my own knowledge till recently was largely limited to the recent two or three hundred years. Gradually I learnt something more of its previous history and found, as I expected, that that history was far from being a blank, that it was a rich history, rich in cultural achievements, rich in political organization, rich, oddly enough, in forms of democracy and state socialism. And yet people, not knowing all this history, have talked about it as a dark continent as if it had no past, no background and no culture. I hope that people will get to know more about it, and I hope in our country, at any rate, the efforts we are making in our School for African Studies here in Delhi University will prosper. We shall welcome here, ever more, students from Africa who will learn something about India, but who, more specially, will teach us something about their own country, because we shall inevitably be thrown more together.

In so far as India can co-operate with and be able to help the people and the State of Ghana, nothing could give us greater pleasure. But I have become more and more convinced that each country has to find its own feet, and do its own thinking. I hope that now that the chance has come to the people of Ghana, and indeed to other parts of Africa also, they will rediscover their roots and grow.

This is a day of rejoicing certainly, but the fulfilment of a long-sought objective or dream invariably brings great responsibilities and new problems. I have no doubt that the people of Ghana and their great leader, Dr. Nkrumah, will face these responsibilities and problems. They have prepared themselves for this task in the last few years. Nothing is worth having if one does not pay the price for it. The people of Ghana have completed one important stage of their journey, but there is no end to the journey of a nation. They have to go ahead in economic and other fields, and what is more, they must always be conscious that the eyes of the whole of Africa and of the rest of the world are on them.

We congratulate the people of Ghana and their leaders, specially Dr. Nkrumah. There are many things happening in Africa which are rather painful to contemplate; there are many dark shadows. So it is our peculiar pleasure that out of that darkness this light has come, which I hope will spread. Those responsible for it deserve our congratulations—certainly the people of Ghana, but also the Government and the people of the United Kingdom, who deserve credit for this. We may criticize them for other things, but undoubtedly this has been something for which they deserve congratulations, and I hope that this example will spread. On my own behalf, and on behalf of the Government and the people of India, I offer our hearty and respectful congratulations to the people of Ghana and their leaders.

POWER VACUUM THEORY

RECENTLY, two of the great men of the biggest and the most powerful nations in the world, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, made certain proposals. The President of the United States made some proposals which are called the Eisenhower Doctrine now. The Soviet Union made some independent proposals. I do not presume, at this stage, to discuss or criticize any of these proposals. I have no doubt that both were meant to advance the cause of security and peace. But what I ventured to suggest on another occasion was that any proposals that were made in an atmosphere of suspicion and fear would not take one far, even when they were good proposals because nobody accepted them as *bona fide* proposals.

I venture to suggest that the situation in the world is serious enough for questions to be tackled face to face by the great leaders, more particularly by the great President of the United States and the leaders of the Soviet Union. It is

From a speech during debate on Foreign Affairs, Lok Sabha, March 25, 1957

possible that such a step would lead to something better than what we have seen in the last few months. On the one occasion that they did meet—it was about two years ago—that meeting resulted in a change in the world atmosphere and kindled the first hopes of some kind of peace.

This is not a question of favouring any particular proposal or not favouring it. I have no doubt that a great deal in President Eisenhower's proposals, more especially the part dealing with economic help, is of importance and of value. I have no doubt that many of the proposals that were put forward by the Soviet Union are helpful, on the face of them. How they are carried out is a different matter.

But there is one approach that troubles me, and that is the idea of thinking that areas in Asia, for instance in West Asia, are vacuums which have to be filled by somebody stepping in from outside. That, I feel, is a dangerous approach. It is an unreal approach to say that every country which has insufficient armaments is a vacuum. At that rate, if you think in terms of armament, there are only two countries which have an adequate supply of hydrogen bombs, the United States of America and the Soviet Union. You may say all other countries are vacuums, because they do not have hydrogen bombs, which would be an absurd thing to say. What is the test then? Military power? Two countries stand out above all others. There are two or three or four other countries which are powerful military nations, and even Great Powers. Outside of these five or six, are all the smaller and militarily weaker countries vacuums? What is the test of this vacuum idea, which is a dangerous idea, especially for Asian and African countries? It seems to me really to lead to the conclusion that where circumstances compel an imperialist Power to withdraw, necessarily you must presume that it has left a vacuum. If so, how is that vacuum to be filled? Surely if somebody else comes in, it is a repetition of the old story, perhaps in a different form. It can only be filled by the people of that country growing and developing themselves economically, politically and otherwise.

There is another difficulty when an outside Power wants to fill such a vacuum, if I may use the word. When there is

conflict in the world between two countries which have their areas of influence, as soon as one country tries to fill a vacuum, the other group suspects its intentions and tries to extend its own area of influence there or elsewhere. You thus get back into this tug-of-war of trying to capture as areas of influence various parts of the world which are not strong enough to stand by themselves.

B. OUR NEIGHBOURS

MILITARY AID TO PAKISTAN

I SHOULD LIKE to refer to the proposed U.S. aid to Pakistan. Recently the House has seen that there has been a pact between Turkey and Pakistan and it is said that this is likely to be followed by some kind of arrangement between the United States and Pakistan for military aid. I spoke about this matter in December last, before the House adjourned, and expressed our concern about it. That concern was not so much due to any ill feeling against Pakistan, and certainly not due to any ill feeling against America. But I felt then, and I have felt strongly ever since, that this step is a wrong step and a step which adds to the tensions and fears of the world. It adds to the feeling of insecurity in Asia. It is, therefore, a wrong step from the point of view of peace and removal of tensions. Some may justify it from a military point of view. But I submit that judging world affairs through soldiers' eyes and ears is a dangerous thing. A soldier's idea of security may be one thing; a politician's or statesman's may be somewhat different. They have to be co-ordinated. When war comes, the soldier is supreme and his voice prevails almost, but not quite. But if the soldier's voice prevails in peacetime, it means that peace is likely to be converted into war.

How do we balance these issues? Here is a kind of evil

Reply to debate on the President's Address, House of the People (Lok Sabha), February 22, 1954

enchantment over the world which prevents us from going in the right direction. For the first time in history the world has strength and power to solve its economic problems, like poverty. But, instead of proceeding to do that and having a better future for the whole of humanity, we have these fears and preparations for war.

How are we to lessen these tensions? Not by thinking in military terms all the time. I agree that no country can weaken itself and offer itself as a target to some other country. Having accepted that, nevertheless, if one is to try for peace, it is not by talking of war, by issuing threats and by preparing all the time for war in a rather loud and aggressive way.

I have stated on earlier occasions that I believe that the Prime Minister of Pakistan earnestly wishes, as I do, that there should be good relations between India and Pakistan. I have no doubt about his motives and I hope he has no doubt about mine. It is not a question of motives. If a step is taken which necessarily has some harmful results, the best of motives do not help. Mr. Mohammed Ali has made various statements about this matter of aid from U.S. He asks why India should object. Of course, they are a free country; I cannot prevent them. But if something affects Asia, India especially, and if something, in our opinion, is a reversal of history after hundreds of years, are we to remain silent? We have thought in terms of freeing our countries, and one of the symbols of freedom has been the withdrawal of foreign armed forces. I say the return of any armed forces from any European or any American country is a reversal of the history of the countries of Asia, whatever the motive. It was suggested some two or three years ago in connection with Kashmir that some European or American countries should send forces to Kashmir. We rejected that completely because, so far as we can see, on no account are we going to allow any foreign forces to land in India.

That is our outlook, and it is something more than a mere Indian outlook. It is an outlook which applies to the whole of or a large part of this continent of Asia. Therefore we regret this military aid coming from the United States to Pakistan. I am sure the United States Government did not have these

considerations before them. They think, naturally, in their own environment, and that is the difficulty. I am not prepared to express my opinion except in the most philosophical manner about the distant problems of Europe. India has not the slightest desire to impose its views or wishes on any other country. But because in Asia we have passed through similar processes of history in the last two hundred years or so, and thus can understand each other a little better, it is likely I am in tune with some of my neighbour countries when I speak. If the Great Powers think that the problems of Asia can be solved *minus* Asia or *minus* the views of Asian countries, then it does seem to be rather odd.

THE CANAL WATERS DISPUTE

YOU KNOW that in the matter of Bhakra-Nangal, our neighbour Pakistan has some complaints and has raised objections. It is a story seven or eight years old, which dates back to the time of Partition. I can understand Pakistan's anxiety. I have been worrying all these years how to solve this question through mutual consultation, to the advantage of both India and Pakistan. Why could this question not be solved till now? Why all this strife? You may perhaps remember that we held talks more than six years ago, when this dispute arose. Representatives of Pakistan and our representatives met at a conference in Delhi. I was also one of them. Therefore, I can speak from personal knowledge. The present Governor-General of Pakistan also participated in the conference and his signature as well as mine are on what was written there. Other Ministers of Pakistan and India and of East and West Punjab have also signed it. A settlement was arrived at. What was the settlement? They told us and we told them that this was not a matter for legal dispute in which lawyers could be engaged and legal quibbles indulged in. The

From a speech in Hindi on the occasion of the opening of the Nangal Canal, July 8, 1954

law did not help in such matters. This was a human problem, a matter affecting the welfare of lakhs and crores of human beings on both sides. We did not raise the matter of legal rights but it was clear that East Punjab could not do without the waters of the Sutlej and other rivers.

We said we did not desire to harm Pakistan. Therefore we had to find out a way which would serve the purpose of both of us. And the way which was found through the agreement of 1948 was this: that India should gradually increase her offtake of waters on the East Punjab side, but bearing in mind that Pakistan should have an opportunity to make alternative arrangements, so that the people on the Pakistan side did not suffer any loss. This was a wise and sensible decision. How can we wish harm to the inhabitants of Pakistan? After all, she is our neighbour, our comrade of yesterday and in a sense a comrade of even today. Besides this, if there is distress and starvation on our borders it would be a danger to us. We desire prosperity for this side as well as that. There may be any number of disputes and quarrels between ourselves and Pakistan today, but a day will come when these disputes and quarrels will end and we shall live in friendship. Therefore, it is a foolish presumption if anyone thinks that we want to do anything which might harm Pakistan and her peasants or landowners, because ultimately her injury will recoil upon us, and create loss and dangers for us. At the same time, however, if anybody should tell us that we cannot under any circumstances take the waters of the Punjab rivers then it does not make sense. Can Punjab and India agree for all time to starve, to remain in poverty and not to make progress? Considering all these things we reached a settlement and Pakistan agreed to it. The agreement was to the effect that we had a right to the waters of the East Punjab rivers and we should give time to West Pakistan to make alternative arrangements, so that they might not suffer any loss. This was not a question of law. It was sense. Please remember that law and sense are not always the same. In this dispute as well as many other disputes, legal experts have made long statements and written big books. I tried to explain that all this labour would be useless. This was not a matter for law, whether it might be raised

in the International Court or in the United Nations. This matter should be settled between the countries where it was a question of life and death for lakhs and crores of people. The proper way is what we followed in 1948 when we all arrived at a settlement. The settlement provided that our engineers and theirs would consider how to secure the good of both of us. You should remember that a very small portion of the waters flowing in the rivers of both the Punjabs is today being utilized. The rest flows into the ocean. There is no dearth of water. If you look at East and West Punjab as a whole there is no lack of water. We only lack an arrangement to take that water to the right places. The right way is to make those arrangements. Some money will probably have to be spent. This is a matter for consideration because we are making arrangements not for today but which would yield results for a hundred or two hundred years. Naturally, these arrangements will require money. We have already spent vast sums on Bhakra-Nangal and we shall have to spend much more. In all, Bhakra-Nangal, it is estimated, will require about 160 crores of rupees. This may appear a big sum of money but look at the benefits to the country and the people. Compared with the benefits, 160 crores of rupees are nothing.

Unfortunately, the agreement arrived at was not put into practice. I was in favour of joint consultations between the engineers of both sides. A thousand obstacles were created from Pakistan's side. They would not talk or allow us to go on. Perhaps they thought that by raising obstacles they would be able to arrest our progress. They could not do that. Now suddenly we are told that the 1948 Agreement was useless and that it was secured under duress. As I told you, it so happened that I was also present at those talks and can give personal testimony. The present Governor-General of Pakistan was also present there as one of the signatories. I cannot understand how I or anybody else could coerce him into appending his signature. It is very undignified for countries to argue like small lawyers. Big countries do big things with big minds, whether it is peace or war. It is not in my nature to indulge in legal quibbling. I gave up law forty years back.

Spokesmen of Pakistan said that they had denounced the 1948 Agreement. An agreement between two parties cannot be abrogated by unilateral action and so the dispute went on. Some people of the World Bank came here from America and talked with us and with Pakistan. They were prepared to mediate, so that our engineers and Pakistani engineers might hold discussions with their help. This was what we had been saying from the very beginning : that our engineers and theirs should hold joint consultations because there was sufficient water for all. So we accepted the World Bank's proposal and said that we were ready, if they could make them agree to joint consultations between the engineers. They told us that as long as the talks went on we should not reduce the supply of water to Pakistan from this side. Please remember that the 1948 Agreement with Pakistan, which I just mentioned, laid down that India had a right to reduce the supply of waters, but this was to be done gradually so that Pakistan might get time. Sufficient time was given and years passed. We had thus a right to reduce the supply of water. Still we agreed to the World Bank's suggestion not to reduce the supply of water as long as the talks under the auspices of the Bank went on. It was not envisaged at that time that this arrangement was meant for all times. We thought that the talks would go on for five or six months and would come to some conclusion. We hoped that the result would be helpful; so, taking everything into consideration, we accepted the suggestion for the duration of about six months. Those six months lengthened into a year, and now to two and a half years. It is a strange situation. Talks which are held with Pakistan go on lengthening so much that there does not seem to be any end to them. I get sick of this. I want a decision this way or that.

The World Bank people put forward a proposition of their own about three or four months ago. It is clear that they had no authority to force us. As mediators they had merely a right to put forward a suggestion. It was for us to accept or reject it. They put forward a suggestion when they thought that our direct talks were not going to yield any result. Their scheme more or less provided for a division of the rivers of the Punjab. Pakistan was to take the waters of some rivers and we were

to take the waters of some other rivers. That is, there was no doubt that we were to get all the waters of our side, but they laid a very great burden on us. We were asked to give financial aid to Pakistan so that she might construct new canals from other rivers to get more water. They did not clearly specify the amount but they indicated a very large sum. It was a heavy burden on us but we considered and consulted the Punjab Government and thought that if the matter was being settled once for all and our welfare as well as the welfare of Pakistan lay in it, then we should accept the payment of the heavy price demanded from us. So we wrote to the World Bank within a few days that we accepted the basic principle put forward by them and though it imposed a very heavy burden on us, we were prepared to pay this price so that the matter might be settled peacefully and we could go on with our work in our country in peace. We said Pakistan would also benefit thereby.

We thus accepted the proposal within a few days, but Pakistan did not give any reply though weeks and months passed. We were very perturbed. Our representatives are still sitting in Washington, New York and other cities of America. A long time has passed and a reply from Pakistan is still awaited. It is a strange situation. We wanted to recall our representatives. They had no work to do, but then we thought that Pakistan might make it a pretext and say that we recalled them. Therefore we let them stay there till such time as a reply was received. In the end we told the World Bank to fix some date for Pakistan's reply so that we might know where we stood; otherwise a whole lifetime might pass in waiting. They accepted our suggestion and told Pakistan that they should reply within a week whether they accepted the principle or not, with details to be settled later. When they did this, Pakistan showed signs of life and began to run about. In the end Sir Zafarullah Khan undertook the long journey to Washington. Many things were said about the issue—neither yes nor no, but that they would consider and so on. The World Bank told them that this reply amounted to a rejection. Should it be taken that they had rejected the proposals or had they something more to say? Pakistan saw

how the matter would end. They felt that if they rejected the proposals and India accepted them, the consequences would perhaps not be good for them, because the effect would have been that our interim agreement would come to an end, the discussions would end and the World Bank's suggestions to us to pay them crores of rupees would become ineffective. The rights of both sides were clear. Then the World Bank asked Pakistan to give a clear reply. We had made our arrangements for the return of our deputation, but only three or four days ago Pakistan said that they accepted the principle underlying the proposals put forward by the World Bank. But they added that they could not give a final reply unless the whole picture was before them. That is the same old legal quibbling. On one side they say that they have accepted the proposals and on the other they keep the door open for escape on the pretext that they have not seen the full picture. This is where matters stand at present.

Meanwhile, when Pakistan did not accept the proposals we wrote to the World Bank that we had been marking time for three months and that we had accepted their proposal, which Pakistan had rejected. Therefore our agreement not to reduce the water supply no longer held good. We resumed our freedom of action. We were ready to talk when they or Pakistan wanted, because we did not intend to shut the door to agreement. But the talks had ended and our delegation would be returning home. The Bank people told us, however, that Pakistan's attitude was changing and that they were saying that they accepted the principle. Since there were chances that a way out would be found, the Bank asked our delegation to wait for a few days more. Our representatives agreed to do so.

The point is that our former agreement with the World Bank or with Pakistan for not reducing the supply of waters has ended. We have every right to reduce it, but we do not want to stand on legal rights in this matter. We want to do something which would harm neither Pakistan nor us. Therefore we again told them that we would do nothing in haste which may harm the landowners and peasants in Pakistan. We would give them a chance to make their own arrangements.

After all we had to reduce the supply of waters but we would do it having regard to the conditions, that is, we still stood by the principles which we accepted in the Agreement of 1948. If you have read the Pakistan newspapers you will see that there is a great storm and outcry, as if something is going to take place on July 8 here in Nangal which would immediately stop the waters flowing into Pakistan and create a drought as a result of which lakhs and crores of people would die of hunger and thirst.

This is wrong and deplorable. We cannot tolerate it. We have told Pakistan clearly, time and again, that for the present we would not reduce the supply of water. It is a fact that they have built one or two canals from which they can take some water. Therefore, they can take water from their side and we would reduce supplies to that extent. This would not reduce their total supply of water. If they could build some more canals as they intend, then this process would go on. The exploratory talks held under the auspices of the World Bank made it clear that there is no dearth of water. Only an arrangement to bring the waters to the desired directions was lacking. It is evident that on our side in East Punjab, we have no other source of water than the Sutlej. You can see that from the map. If we do not take water from it, it would mean that we have no water at all. We should totally deprive ourselves of water and no progress would be possible. Whether it is East Punjab, PEPSU or Rajasthan, they would always remain dry. On the other side, they have many rivers from which they can easily take water with a little hard work. We are ready to help them with money to do this. What is their difficulty then?

As I have said, we do not want to harm Pakistan. As a Government we do not proceed on the principle that we should inflict loss on Pakistan. It would not be proper if lakhs of landowners and peasants suffered a loss. It is against our principles and, as I have told you, it is a dangerous thing to do on our borders. It is out of the question. We do not want at this juncture that there should be any reduction in the waters which they have been getting. There will be rains in a few days. After that, we have a right to reduce the supply to



Being greeted by President Eisenhower, on arrival at the White House, Washington, during visit to the United States of America, December 1956

With Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld, Secretary-General of the United Nations, at U. N. Headquarters, New York, December 1956






Speaking in Ottawa after being greeted by Mr. Louis St. Laurent, Prime Minister of Canada, December 1956

Bidding goodbye to Mr. Chou En-lai, Prime Minister of China, at the Palam airport, New Delhi, January 1957





Speaking at Trombay near Bombay, at the formal inauguration of Apsara, swimming pool reactor of the Indian Atomic Energy Department, January 1957

At the sixth conference of Development Commissioners, Mussoorie, April 1957





With children of farmers affected by storm near New Delhi, April 1957



Speaking at Colombo, on his visit to Ceylon to participate in Buddha Jayanti celebrations, May 1957. Alongside is Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike, Prime Minister of Ceylon.

Being seen off at Palam airport by Dr. Rajendra Prasad, Dr. Radhakrishnan, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, Shri V. K. Krishna Menon and Shri U. N. Dhebar at the time of departure on a tour of the Scandinavian countries and Britain, June 1957



the extent to which they have made alternative arrangements. There is only one way by which there would be no ultimate reduction, and the way is that they should speedily make other arrangements and construct canals to draw water from their rivers. We would meanwhile go on reducing supply to the extent they have augmented their own supply. It is a simple proposition. We in India have given priority to big projects like Bhakra-Nangal, Damodar and Hirakud, to construction of canals, to generation of electricity and to the setting up of big factories. You know that we have set up a magnificent fertilizer factory at Sindri. Big railway engines are being manufactured at Chittaranjan. Railway coaches are being made, aeroplanes and ocean-going ships are being built and we have many big factories working. India is fired with an enthusiasm for work. Construction is going on all round. I do not want to criticize a neighbouring country but I submit that energy in Pakistan is spent in disputes and clamours instead of work. If she had done even one-fourth of what India is doing, she would have made sufficient progress. The dispute about waters and other disputes would all have been settled long ago. But I regret that in Pakistan less attention is paid to work and to the building up of the country and more to disputes and family feuds. I wish and you should all wish that Pakistan should progress. It is a matter for regret that instead of seeking the advancement of their country through their own efforts they want to advance by dependence on other countries. No country or individual in the history of the world so far has been able to stand on the legs of others.

As far as Bhakra-Nangal is concerned, for the last six or seven years, thousands and lakhs of people have been toiling on it. Much money has been spent and now it is taking some shape and we shall be able to reap some benefit from it. It will take four or five years more to complete the project. The work is difficult, and the really difficult part of the work is the construction of the dam which will be one of the most remarkable in the world. This work is to be taken up now. The world has to understand and Pakistan should understand that this work will go on with vigour. Let them not believe that it can be stopped. There is no power which can arrest our

harnessing of this surging river. But we are ready to help the people of Pakistan to make their plans so that there may not be any dearth of water. On the contrary, they may get more than what they are getting now. They can get more because they have an inexhaustible supply of water if only they construct their canals. This is the situation. Under these circumstances, why should there be complaints and outcry except that in Pakistan they are averse to work? They want somehow to gain advantage without work, and that is not reasonable. I thought it proper to place this picture before you because there are complaints in Pakistan and in some other countries which create great misunderstanding, and I do not want misunderstanding.

OFFER TO PAKISTAN

I SHOULD LIKE to make a brief reference to a speech delivered by the Prime Minister of Pakistan yesterday in his Parliament. Normally, I would wait for a fuller and more authoritative version before commenting on the speech. But as I am speaking here today, I should say something about it.

I have read a brief report of this speech with sorrow and surprise. Chaudhuri Mohammed Ali has spoken in anger and has made some statements which are manifestly incorrect. He says that India has been carrying on a campaign of fear and hatred and created an atmosphere of hatred against Pakistan. It is easy to compare the press of India with the press of Pakistan and the statements made by responsible persons in India with those made in Pakistan. For long there have been the most virulent attacks in Pakistan on India and frequent appeals for *jihad*. Has any responsible person or newspaper in India talked of war or indeed talked of hatred? We have even now an unceasing flow of migrants from East Pakistan to India. That is a great burden on us and a matter

for serious concern. We have naturally drawn attention to this and to the reasons which compel people to leave their hearths and homes and lands and seek refuge in another country.

Mr. Mohammed Ali has referred to the recent border incidents and has said that they had been created by India and that in every single instance, aggression had come from the Indian side. It is a little difficult for me to deal with statements which have little connection with truth. I can give long lists of these incidents and I can give the facts in so far as we know and any impartial authority can judge. I shall only mention one well-known incident here because, in this case, an impartial authority did enquire and judge and give its decision. That was the Nekowal incident on the Jammu border. The United Nations Observers enquired into this and stated clearly where the fault lay. The then Prime Minister of Pakistan had assured us publicly that he would abide by the decision of the U.N. Observers and punish those who were guilty. We still await the carrying out of this assurance. We have written repeatedly, with no effect.

Mr. Mohammed Ali has said that he wrote to me and made certain proposals and that he had received no reply from me. This is correct. But this message reached me the night before last. We have had just one day to consider it. We hope to send an answer soon. In his message, Mr. Mohammed Ali has referred to a decision reached at a meeting of the Joint Steering Committee on March 11 and 12, 1955, for the demarcation of the Indo-Pakistan border and apparently accuses India of delay in giving effect to this decision. This decision was further considered at a meeting of our Home Minister with the Pakistan Home Minister in May 1955 and they arrived at an agreement, referred to as the Pant-Mirza agreement. The Pakistan Government took no action for the ratification of this agreement till the end of 1955, and then suggested certain amendments to the agreement, which, in effect, largely modified it. However, I welcome the Prime Minister's proposal for the demarcation of the Indo-Pakistan border and we are prepared to take it up immediately.

Mr. Mohammed Ali has suggested in his speech that India and Pakistan should declare that they would never go to war with each other. I welcome this proposal. Everyone knows that we have been suggesting a no-war declaration by both India and Pakistan for some years now. Our proposal, however, was not accepted by the Pakistan Government. I am glad that Mr. Mohammed Ali now looks with favour on this proposal and we shall gladly pursue the matter further.

There can be no greater folly than conflict between India and Pakistan. We have endeavoured to create friendly feelings between the two countries and I believe that, in spite of many unfortunate occurrences, there is today a large measure of friendship between the people of India and the people of Pakistan. It is not by military methods or threats of war or by talking to each other from so-called positions of strength that we shall come nearer. In this world of the atom bomb, both India and Pakistan are weak. But we can develop strength in other ways, strength in friendship, in co-operation and through raising the standards of our people. In all goodwill and earnestness, I offer Panchsheel to the Prime Minister of Pakistan and I have every faith that if we base our dealings with one another on these Five Principles, the nightmare of fear and suspicion will fade away.

EAST BENGAL EXODUS

MY COLLEAGUES, the Minister of Law and Minority Affairs and the Minister of Rehabilitation, have stated before this House the facts relating to the exodus from East Pakistan in some detail. This continuing major migration is of immense significance. Apart from the great burden on us, it is greatly harming Pakistan too. Do not imagine that this kind of migration is ultimately good for the country from which it takes place. I have no doubt that the migration from East Bengal

From a speech in Lok Sabha, March 29, 1956

has hit East Pakistan hard. The quality of East Bengal has gone down. Naturally when trained and skilled people go out, quality suffers. It is not numbers that count, but quality. And a good deal of quality has gone out of East Pakistan.

If you go back in history, you will see that one of the reasons for the industrial advance of England was the fact that religious wars drove out very prosperous weavers from France and other parts of Europe to England. It was those people through whom gradually industrialization developed and inventions came about. It is thus a very shortsighted policy for those in Pakistan to imagine that by seizing hold of some houses, properties and jobs here and there, and driving out people who have played an important part in the economic life of the country, they would be doing good to themselves.

Shri Gadgil made a suggestion about asking Pakistan for land. One doesn't ask for things which are patently going to be refused and which one has no means of getting by other ways. No country gives up land. Why should Pakistan? If they are prepared to give up land, they could very well settle the people on that land.

Undoubtedly, a situation has arisen when the leaders of Pakistan themselves realize the extreme gravity of what is happening. I do not think that it is the Government of Pakistan or even the present Government of East Bengal that wants to encourage this exodus. It is the large number of minor officials and others who have very probably encouraged it.

HARM OF TWO-NATION THEORY

MR. SPEAKER, SIR, the President's Address, which this House has been discussing, deals with a period of about one year. But perhaps we are discussing this Address as covering even a longer period, that is, the period of the life of the present Parliament, as this is the last occasion when this Parliament will consider such an Address.

It is not my intention to go through the history of the last five years or ten years at this stage of the debate. I wish merely to draw the attention of the House to the need to take a larger view. We are apt often to lose ourselves in the trees and forget the wood. In considering our policy, domestic or external, it is perhaps profitable to look round the world and see what has happened elsewhere, how the world has shaped itself during this momentous period of history since the last War ended. It is profitable to study what has happened in Asia which, since the War, has shown a tremendous vitality. Then, perhaps, we shall have a better yardstick to measure our own achievements or failures.

It is easy for all of us to want to go faster, to be impatient of the many evils that surround us—inertia, inefficiency and all that. And yet, to balance that impatience, we should see this larger picture and see what has happened in other countries around us.

I put this thought before hon. Members of this House because, speaking with all modesty, and looking at this broad picture, I do feel that the achievements of this Parliament during the last five years, and those of the preceding Parliament—in other words, the achievements of the people of India during the last ten years—have been not only considerable, but striking. I do not for an instant forget our failures. But I think it would not be right for us to lay stress only on the lack of achievement even as it would not be right to lay stress only on the achievement. Looking at both sides of the picture, I think it may be said with justice that we have

advanced on the political plane, on the economic plane and on the social plane.

Most of us, whether on this or the other side of the House, have been engaged for long years in the struggle for India's freedom. We were engaged in the Indian revolution which was, as the world recognizes, a major revolution, even though it was a peaceful one and its methods were different. We did not imagine, I am glad to say, that the work of the revolution had ended when the political aspect of it was completed. We all agreed that the political revolution had to be carried on to the economic and social field. Most of us, not all, were conditioned by these past events. When we pledged ourselves to our present tasks, however lacking in worth we might have been, we had this basis of a revolutionary background in the country.

I am saying this merely to point out something that the people seem to forget—not so much in India, perhaps, but outside—that we in this country are still the children of revolution. We have been largely conditioned by it. We may forget it; we may become weak and falter or slip. That is another matter. But there is some difference between a country which has gained its freedom by a revolutionary process, peaceful or not, and a country which has by chance, you might say, attained a certain objective. The revolutionary process conditions the character of a people. It gives them the ability to resist and to go ahead; it builds up their capacity for sacrifice. When other countries judge us, let them remember that we are the children of the Indian Revolution and not persons who, by some automatic occurrence, gained freedom. Let them remember that we cannot, therefore, be dealt with in a casual way as other countries sometimes are dealt with, because they gained their independence, if I may say so, rather accidentally and as a result of India's struggle for independence.

We started building democracy. We aimed at socialism. We aimed at higher standards for our people. We aimed at a Welfare State. How far have we succeeded in preserving the democratic structure and yet gone ahead fairly fast? It would be interesting to look at other countries with whom we are

friends and whom we wish well. Some of them claim to be democratic, but how many of them have even the trappings of democracy, let alone the inner content of it? There are not many such countries in the world, certainly not many in Asia. Our neighbour with whom we have tried to be friends, Pakistan, finds it very difficult to carry on with any democratic process.

This morning's news is that the whole Constitution of West Pakistan has been suspended by the President. I sympathize with the people of Pakistan and the Government of West Pakistan. I am not criticizing them; I am merely pointing out the difficulties they have experienced in maintaining even the trappings of democracy. I am not going into the inner content, which is a much more difficult thing to have. Two years ago—or was it three years ago?—there was a great election in East Pakistan with a very big majority for one party. And then, within two or three months of the election, the Constitution was suspended. It is not for me to say whether it was justified or not. I am merely pointing out how difficult it has been for this neighbour country of ours to function in a democratic way, even in a most elementary sense. Indeed, it is stated there that they want what is called a “controlled democracy”, whatever that might be. It is at any rate something different from normal democracy.

Looking at other countries round about us, countries which are struggling against disruptive tendencies, countries in which various groups are wasting their energies in fighting one another, and countries which receive a good deal of military and other foreign aid, I find that in spite of that aid they have no roots in democracy or in free government. We talk about the Free World. How many countries which presume to belong to the Free World have the trappings of democracy or freedom?

In India, in spite of all its failings, I submit the democratic process has worked. It may not have worked perfectly, because there is no perfection in this world, but it has, nevertheless, worked with remarkable success. At the same time, the progress on economic and social lines has been considerable. I add ‘social’ specially, because it is no easy matter for a

country like India to advance far in the social field by the democratic process. The laws that this Parliament approved of in regard to Hindu law reform were, I think, among the more remarkable, in the sense that they touch our people intimately.

People talk about opposition. The real opposition in India is not the opposition of the hon. Members sitting opposite; but it is the opposition of all kinds of disruptive tendencies, inertia, reaction. In a great country like ours, all of us have to fight this opposition.

There is talk abroad of our having done, in Kashmir, something against the decision of the Security Council. May I deal first with the criticism made here often, that we were wrong in taking this matter to the Security Council? Whether we were right or wrong, I do not think it does much good referring to it again and again ten years afterwards. But I do not think we were wrong because the alternative at that time for us was war with Pakistan. Well, we deliberately did not want war with Pakistan if we could avoid it. So we went to the Security Council. So long as we belong to the United Nations we have to function as a member of the United Nations. So long as we believe in the processes of the Charter of the United Nations, we have to function that way. We cannot say that when it affects us we shall ignore the United Nations, and when it affects somebody else we will believe in the United Nations. Surely that is not a legitimate or consistent position to take up.

Why did we go to the Security Council? We did not ask the United Nations to decide on accession and so on. That was an accomplished fact, and we did not want anybody else's authority to tell us that accession was right or not. We went there to ask the Security Council to call upon Pakistan to withdraw its forces from Indian Union territory. That was the main object.

We are sometimes accused of ignoring the resolutions of the Security Council and of violating them. I must confess that after the deepest study I do not know what this means. I have asked people to tell me, and nobody has been able to point out any such thing. This applies particularly to the U.N.

resolution of January 24, which was passed apparently under some misapprehension though I do not know why anyone should misapprehend the situation. In spite of adequate explanation from our representative, there was in the Security Council some misapprehension that something was going to happen on January 26 this year. Nothing was going to happen except the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly of the Jammu and Kashmir State.

Much is made of what is called the annexation of Jammu and Kashmir State. If it means accession, Jammu and Kashmir State had acceded to us nine and a half years earlier. We cannot annex something that is already with us. The people who accuse us seem to ignore completely the fact that nearly half of Jammu and Kashmir State territory has been practically annexed by Pakistan. Whatever rights or wrongs there may be in regard to India's being there—we think we are completely right—nobody has even remotely suggested that Pakistan has the slightest right to be there. Under what right is Pakistan there? Patently it has no right and yet for nine years it has been occupying that territory.

We have always advocated the peaceful approach to world problems, the approach of peaceful settlement. We cannot adopt a different policy in Kashmir or in Goa without violating that major approach of ours. That has been both our strength and our weakness, for one cannot ride two horses or follow two contradictory policies. Some friends have thought that our insistence on following a policy of peace all the time is a weakness of our policy.

But look at the picture of the world. We live on the verge of disaster; atomic and nuclear weapons are constantly being produced; experimental explosions take place and sudden crises arise which bring the world to the verge of war. Also for the first time in the world's history, we are faced with a new possibility and a new contingency. There have been wars in the past; where they occurred something survived—some civilization, some culture, some history, some accumulation of human experience. And after the war was over, it grew again from what survived. Today, however, we have to face the contingency that all history and all human experience

might be wiped off, leaving nothing behind. This contingency has arisen because of the terrible weapons of mass destruction which destroy not only outwardly and suddenly, but slowly and insidiously by getting into our very marrow, by radiation. All our problems, and all the conflict of ideologies pale into insignificance before the major fact that if somehow we go over this brink, then all history and all the past experience of humanity might be wiped off.

Ultimately this danger can be held back only by the character of the human being, by the peaceful approach, by the compassionate approach. Therefore, the cold war approach is an exceedingly bad approach. It is based essentially on violence and hatred. It is a bad thing, which, if not controlled, will lead to disaster. As a result of this cold war, armaments go on being piled up; and experimental explosions of nuclear weapons take place, even when scientists declare that each explosion adds to the vitiation of the atmosphere.

The other day someone said, speaking about SEATO, that SEATO would preserve peace in South-East Asia for a thousand years. That means, I suppose, the continuation of cold war for a thousand years.

This whole approach of cold war and military alliances, if persisted in, will some time or other lead to the final catastrophe. I do not venture to offer advice. I know that there are many things that we would like to do in this country which we cannot do, for fear of rendering our country weak and unprotected. We dare not take that risk, and if I dare not take that risk, I cannot obviously ask other countries to take that risk. At the same time, it is equally obvious that this race in armaments and this continuation of cold war are an even greater risk than anything else.

Some people do not like our criticizing these pacts. So far as we are concerned, all pacts—whether it is the Warsaw Pact or SEATO or the Baghdad Pact—are dangerous, and all of them add to hatred, fear and apprehension. Somehow each person thinks that he has to keep going because of the other, just as many countries say that they will stop nuclear explosions provided everybody else stops them. Everybody says so and nobody stops them, and so they go on.

We have seen recently how the Baghdad Pact and SEATO were dragged in with regard to the Kashmir issue. You see how one thing affects the other and how a wrong step leads to innumerable other wrong steps. The other day the Prime Minister of Pakistan, describing the Baghdad Pact, used rather striking language. He said: zero plus zero plus zero plus zero equals zero. His point was that unless some powerful country like the United Kingdom or the United States was in the Baghdad Pact with its big defence apparatus, all the other members of it, from the point of view of armament, were relatively zero. There is another aspect to it. When a country considering itself zero attaches itself to some figure, it is the figure that counts, not the zero, obviously.

Recent events have shown us that one cannot build a country which has no roots in its own past. Nor can one impose anything on a country. We saw in Central Europe some months ago, in the case of Hungary, how ten or eleven years' attempt did not succeed in such imposition. The nationalism of Hungary was strong and tried to resist. It was an extraordinary example of what deep roots nationalism has in a country.

I venture to submit that the two-nation theory which was advanced in India some years before independence and to which reference is still made in our neighbour country, is a theory which makes a country rootless. It ignores the roots of a country in its past, and tries to impose something without those roots. I would in all humility say this to the people and leaders of Pakistan. I have sympathized with them in their difficulties. But their major difficulty has been their having uprooted themselves from their own past—I am not talking about India—and tried to develop something in the air on the basis of the two-nation theory. The result is that they have to rely more and more on external force and external aid. They think in terms of an equation of religion, nationalism and statehood. That is a medieval conception. The conception of joining statehood to a religion is so out of place that no amount of repetition of it can make it real; and it becomes still more unreal when it is sought to be applied to, let us say, Kashmir.

So we see in the Kashmir issue not only the basic facts to which I have referred but a basic conflict between the modern age and medievalism, a basic conflict between progress and reaction, a basic conflict between the welfare of the people of Kashmir and their ruination. Some time ago, the Prime Minister of Pakistan himself said that he did not believe in the two-nation theory. I was glad to read that, because I hoped that other things would flow from it. I still hope that that might happen, but, unfortunately, it is not apparently easy even for him to give things a new direction. Meanwhile, it is the two-nation theory which has led, in the final analysis, to this alarming and continuous exodus from East Pakistan. As long as that theory prevails, whether there is exodus or not, there can never be real contentment and satisfaction.

PEOPLE OF INDIAN DESCENT IN CEYLON

I FIND A GREAT DEAL of difficulty in dealing with this matter of people of Indian descent in Ceylon because I am quite convinced that this, more than other questions, is a question which can be solved only in a friendly and peaceful way, and I do not wish to say or do anything which ruffles the atmosphere or makes it a little more difficult. The House knows that some months ago—in January, I think—there was what was called the Indo-Ceylonese Agreement. That was rather a big word to describe it; it was not a solution, but it was an understanding as to how to proceed about the matter in order to reach a solution. There were certain procedures, and one of the things that we laid down specifically was that neither Government would take any step in this matter without consulting the other. That, of course, does not lessen the sovereignty of either Government in the least. It is a very common thing for two countries to decide that they would consult each other. That does not make them less sovereign or

less independent. Since then, nothing very big has happened, but certain small things that have happened have made large numbers of people in Ceylon very apprehensive about the future. There is the problem, hon. Members will remember, of persons who, at the present moment, can only be described as stateless. They are certainly not Indian nationals. They and their families have lived in Ceylon for a long time; many of them have been born there. Normally they would be Ceylon nationals. Ceylon of course has the right and authority to decide about its own nationals. So long as Ceylon does not accept these people as nationals, they are nationals of no state. They are certainly not Indian nationals. So they have become stateless people living in Ceylon and hoping for Ceylonese nationality. In fact, they have applied for it, nearly all of them.

I am not at the moment referring to the Indian nationals who are there. They are there in large numbers too, probably 1,50,000. The House should always distinguish between the two. The Indian nationals who are in Ceylon claim only the normal rights of no discrimination and of freedom to function as any other foreign nationals in Ceylon can claim. The others are people of Indian descent who have been there for a long time, some of them for generations. Nobody has been able to go to Ceylon from India as an immigrant legally for the last fifteen years, in fact since the 'thirties. There have, of course, been illegal immigrants, but leave them out. The Indian nationals in Ceylon constitute a separate problem, because there is a certain process of squeezing them out. While I may regret the manner in which it is being done I cannot challenge the right of the Ceylon Government to deal with any individual as they choose to. But when it is not a question of an individual but large groups, then the situation becomes more difficult. Most of these Indian nationals there are professional people, merchants, domestic employees and so on.

The other problem, and the real problem, is that of the so-called applicants for Ceylonese nationality. The matter is being considered by a committee in Ceylon which accepts some applications and rejects the others. Lately

there have been far more rejections than acceptances. I do not wish to go more deeply into this question except to express my regret at the trend of events in Ceylon which has produced this strong apprehension. There are, after all, 6,00,000 or 7,00,000 of these persons in Ceylon; it is a fairly large number and it is to the interest of Ceylon, as it is to the interest of these people, to settle the matter peacefully; otherwise, an unfortunate feeling of conflict will naturally persist, which will do no good to anybody.

*

*

*

BEFORE COMING to the larger issues of the world, I shall say a word about Ceylon. I should not like to say much because the Prime Minister of Ceylon is coming here in about ten days' time and it would not be fair or courteous for me to discuss these matters. But I would say that the so-called agreement that we arrived at many months ago has not proved a success. Among various matters, the principal question is about the fate of a considerable number of people of Indian descent—remember, people of Indian descent, not Indian nationals—who are in Ceylon. What is their future going to be? An hon. Member who is very much concerned about this question said something about the large numbers of Chinese who are in various countries of South-East Asia and elsewhere. It was a perfectly relevant observation. There are considerable numbers of Indians too in other countries. In fact, in discussing other questions with the Prime Minister of China, I pointed out to him the large number of Chinese in South-East Asia and a fairly considerable number, not quite so many, of Indians too. I told him that both because of the size of our respective countries and because our populations have overflowed into other countries, the smaller countries round about us were understandably afraid of us. They were afraid of China or India, depending upon where geography had put them. He agreed with me and said he would do everything in his power to get rid of this fear in so far as he could.

From a speech during Foreign Affairs debate, Lok Sabha, September 30, 1954

In regard to Ceylon, there is the fact that Ceylon is a relatively small island very near to India. Because of this there is a fear—which I think is completely unjustified—that India may overwhelm Ceylon and absorb it. I have repeatedly said that nobody in India thinks that way. We want an independent Ceylon and a friendly Ceylon. In every sense Ceylon is nearer to us than any other country—culturally, historically, linguistically, and even in the matter of religion.

Why should we look with greedy eyes on Ceylon? We do not. But the fact remains there is fear, and because there is this fear, I would beg this House not to say at any time things which might add to that fear. A Member talked of economic sanctions and the like; I deprecate that kind of talk, although I have been deeply pained by many events in Ceylon, because I want this House and this country to look ahead. We are a country with a great future. It is proper for us not to get lost in the present, but to have some vision of the future. We should not do things now which may come in the way of that future, whether in regard to Pakistan or Ceylon or any other country. We should treat and continue to deal with Ceylon in a friendly way, even though Ceylon's response might be unfriendly.

Coming to this Agreement, the question is about the large numbers of people who are now sometimes called stateless. They are not our nationals; and if the Ceylon Government does not make them their nationals, they have for the moment no regular constitutional position of being attached to any state. Of course, they are in Ceylon.

This raises legal and constitutional issues, as well as issues of social well-being and decency.

In the past two or three decades, such questions arose in another context. When Hitler started his career as Chancellor in Germany, large numbers of people fled from Germany, and they became stateless because no other state would father them, and Hitler, far from fathering them, was after their blood. This question of stateless people became an important constitutional issue in Europe and elsewhere. In fact, many books have been written on the subject. I do not

mean to say that question is at all comparable to the question of people of Indian descent in Ceylon, but I am merely referring to an important constitutional aspect. Normally speaking, people are not driven out of a country, even if they are nationals of another country. Individuals may be sent out if they misbehave, but whole crowds, tens and twenties and hundreds and thousands of people, are not sent out. Such a thing is unknown, except under very abnormal conditions such as prevailed under Hitler.

This is the background. We shall gladly meet the Prime Minister of Ceylon and his colleagues, when they come here, and talk to them in a friendly way.

I AM NOT prepared to use any strong language about Ceylon, in so far as I can help it, because I feel strongly that the broad policy that we pursue everywhere applies in a special measure to our neighbours. And even though they have often said hard, unconscionable things about us, we have refrained from saying anything in reply, because I know very well that the people of Ceylon are friendly to the people of India, by and large. But unfortunately, various hangovers and various fears and suspicions come in the way, which make this problem difficult of solution.

I should like the House to remember that the problem is not that of Indian citizens, as one hon. Member referred to it. If it were a problem of Indian citizens, there would be no problem to be settled immediately. It is a problem of the people who are not Indian citizens. It is a problem of the people of Indian descent, who never were citizens of India, but in whose fate we are interested, for historical, cultural and other reasons. Normally we would not be interested in them, but both Ceylon and we have inherited certain things. We were both parts, at one time, of the British Empire, and we were all dubbed as British subjects. And all kinds of things happened in the British Empire, and a large number of

From reply to Foreign Affairs debate, Rajya Sabha,
September 6, 1955

Indians were taken to Ceylon and put down there, in tea estates chiefly, and so many of them have been living there for generations. I think they are by now the citizens of Ceylon.

The hon. Member, Dr. Subbaroyan, made a very remarkable suggestion. He asked : Why not apply the Indonesian-Chinese parallel to Ceylon, that is, make them choose their nationality? If he had known anything about Ceylon, he would have found that that was the same thing that had been said by us for many, many years. But it is the other party that has to apply it, not we. According to us, the difficulty is created by the Government of Ceylon. There are two separate questions. There are the Indian nationals, and they should be treated with the courtesy which foreign nationals receive. If they are not getting that amount of courtesy, then it is up to the Government of India to protest. We may say that they are there as guests, or they are permitted to remain there as foreign nationals, and they should be treated with the same courtesy as is extended to foreign nationals here in India. The second question is about the others. Their status is different, because we are not directly responsible for them. These 8,00,000 or 9,00,000 people are people of Indian descent, but according to us they have ceased to be Indian nationals. Their problem concerns us chiefly because of certain historical and other reasons. We are prepared to accept them as our nationals if they want to become our nationals and if they satisfy our tests of nationality. Our tests of nationality are very broad; for example, if their fathers and grandfathers were our nationals these people could become our nationals, if they want to. But we say, at the same time, that an equal opportunity should be given to them to become Ceylon's nationals, if they so choose. That is exactly what Dr. Subbaroyan has said. This was more or less agreed to, and both the Ceylon Government and the Government of India opened registers for such people as wanted to apply for the respective nationality. We have not, I believe, rejected even a single application thus far. A very large number of people had applied for Ceylonese nationality. The proportion of registrations was not good, to begin with, but it was at least appreciable. That was about a year or two ago. In the first

year, I am told, about 46 per cent were registered. But the proportion of registrations recently has come down to one per cent of the applications. The rest are rejected. And what are the reasons for rejection? I remember there are estate labourers there, a very fine lot whom I admire. I had said in Ceylon once—probably in 1938 when I was not Prime Minister—that a day would come when the people in Ceylon would put up a monument to the tea estate labourers who had come from India and who had done so much for Ceylon. It is these people who apply for citizenship. They are summoned to answer certain questions. But many never receive the summonses, which are sent to the estate managers, possibly in a bundle. And the estate managers are not at all interested in this question. The result is that the people summoned do not appear before the officials concerned, and a large number of applications are therefore dismissed and rejected on the ground of non-appearance. And the poor people would not even have known what had happened. There are other reasons also for rejection, but they are only formal reasons.

This question, basically, is between the Ceylon Government and these people. We come in because we are interested in these people. They are not our citizens, which we must remember. If they had been Indian nationals, the position would have been completely different. They are not Indian nationals, and the Ceylon Government apparently do not like this idea. For, when we say that they are not our nationals, it means that we are not going to accept them here. We have to accept our nationals only, if they are pushed out from there. But we are not going to accept the others. Whatever the legal position about their nationality, they are the residents and inhabitants of Ceylon, and have been so for generations. We suggested to the Ceylon Government in our recent messages that we would be glad if they dealt with them directly.

C. THE PROBLEM OF GOA

FUTURE STATUS OF AREA

THE SITUATION in respect of the Portuguese Settlements in India, which has aroused much attention and concern both in the House and the country, has continually engaged the study and active consideration of Government. Internally in the Portuguese Settlements, the opposition and resistance to foreign and colonial rule has gathered momentum. This is an entirely Goan movement, popular and indigenous. It has been countered by the authorities in the traditional but discredited methods of colonial assertion, repression and authoritarian violence coupled with the denial of the inherent rights of the people to their freedom and self-determination.

The position of the Government of India, and indeed of the people of this country, is well known and hardly needs restatement. Goa and the Union of India form one country. As a result of foreign conquest, various parts of India came under colonial domination. Historical developments brought almost the entire country under British rule. But some small pockets of territory remained under the colonial rule of other foreign Powers, chiefly because they were tolerated as such by the then British power. The movement for freedom in India was not confined to any part of the country. Its objective was the freedom of the entire country from every kind of foreign domination. Inevitably the movement took shape in what was called British India and ultimately resulted in the withdrawal of the colonial Power and the establishment of the Republic of India. That process of liberation will not be complete till the remaining small pockets of foreign territory are also freed from colonial control. The Government and the people of this country, therefore, fully sympathize with the aspirations of the Goan people to free themselves from alien rule and to be reunited with the motherland.

The policy that we have pursued has been, even as in India under British rule, one of non-violence and we have fashioned our approach and conduct accordingly. This adherence to non-violence means

- (i) that we may not abandon or permit any derogation of our identification with the cause of our compatriots under Portuguese rule; and
- (ii) equally we may not adopt, advocate or deliberately bring about situations of violence.

We regard and base our position on the fact that the liberation movement is Goan and spontaneous, and that its real strength lies in this fact.

The Government of India, and I am confident the great majority of our people, have no intention of adopting any policy or methods which depart from these principles, which are the foundations on which our very nationhood rests and which are the historic and unique legacy of Gandhiji and the pioneers of our freedom.

Further, we may never forget that, in our approach and endeavours for our own freedom we were enjoined to eliminate fear. I want to say in all sincerity that the Government do not and will not function in this matter on a foundation of apprehensiveness and fear of probable consequences of threats, from whatever quarter they may come, or condone, much less approve or support, methods of conduct based on fear. Such methods are opposed to our policy and deny the basic ideas of non-violence.

The Portuguese Government have indulged in reckless allegations and unrestrained abuse of us. Moved by the fear characteristic of those whose strength is based on force, they have sought to amass their military strength on their possessions in India to terrorize the people. They are well aware that they constitute no terror for us.

It is not, however, the intention of the Government of India to be provoked into thinking and acting in military terms. The Portuguese concentrations and ship movements may well be a violation of our national and international rights. We shall examine and consider these and take such legitimate measures as may be necessary. But we have no

intention of following the Portuguese Government's example in this respect.

The Portuguese Government have, in their representations to us and to other countries, as well as in their crude propaganda, indulged in totally untrue and reckless allegations. The purpose of all this is to arouse opinion against us by painting us as aggressive militarists, anti-Christian, particularly anti-Catholic, and hypocritical expansionists. They want others to believe that we want to make Goa an Indian colony.

These allegations are repudiated by the Goan people in the Portuguese possessions themselves, despite the authoritarian regime there and the repression, the censorship and State-controlled propaganda. The Goan liberation movement, however, continues to grow and may well be measured by the increase in violence and recklessness of Portuguese allegations and propaganda. Goans outside Goa, mainly in India and East Africa, have expressed themselves in favour of this movement. They demand the end of alien rule and the reunion of Goa with the motherland.

The Portuguese allegations about Indian hostility to Roman Catholics and the danger to Catholics if Goa joined the Indian Union have been repudiated most emphatically by the Roman Catholics of India and, more particularly, by their eminent leaders. The Catholics in India regard these Portuguese allegations not only as false but as a slur on themselves and their country. They point to the five million Catholics in India, who have absolute religious freedom and enjoy the consideration and respect of the rest of their compatriots. They know that the guarantees of our Constitution are a reality. Recently, at a widely attended meeting of Goans in Bombay, composed of people of all shades of opinion, mostly non-sectarian and non-party, this feeling found emphatic expression and the falsity of Portuguese allegations was exposed.

I deeply regret that the Portuguese Government should have decided to arouse religious passions to serve their colonial ends. They have failed in this endeavour.

I should like to take this opportunity of stating once again

some aspects of our basic approach in respect of Goa, when it becomes a part of the Indian Union :

- (a) The freedom and rights guaranteed by the Constitution of India and which specifically refer to freedom of conscience, worship and practice of religions, will extend in full measure and in all their implications to these areas.
- (b) The special circumstances of cultural, social and lingual relations and the sense of a territorial group which history has created will be respected.
- (c) Laws and customs which are part of the social pattern of these areas and which are consistent with fundamental human rights and freedoms, will be respected and modifications will be sought only by negotiation and consent.
- (d) As we have done in the rest of India, full use will be made of the administrative, judicial and other services, confident that the return of freedom to and the unity of these areas with the motherland will enable adjustments to be made in harmony with progress and with the desires of the people.

The House knows that recently some Notes have been exchanged between the Portuguese Government and the Government of India. They have been placed on the table of the House. It will be evident from these Notes that the Government of India have stated their position with firmness, clarity and restraint and unprovoked by either the language or the content of the Portuguese Notes. The Government believe and are confident that the House will agree that this is and should be the way of behaviour of governments. I shall refrain from detailed comments on the Notes exchanged except to say that, consistent with their policy of settling differences and resolving problems by conciliation and negotiation, the Government of India promptly accepted the very first offer of the Portuguese Government to co-operate with them on the issue of impartial observation. The Government of India have no objection to this and they have nothing to conceal. They have proposed that representatives of the

two Governments should meet together at once and implement the principle on which they have agreed. The last Note of the Portuguese Government appears to raise some further doubts and difficulties, but the Government of India have intimated their firm desire to pursue conciliation and negotiation and urged the Portuguese Government to enable the conference to begin.

I would like to say on behalf of my country and Government that we have no animosity towards Portugal or her people. We believe the freedom of the Goans, now subject to Portugal, would be a gain for Portugal as well. We will continue to pursue, with patience and firmness, the path of conciliation and negotiation. Equally, we must declare that we would be false to our history and betray the cause of freedom itself if we did not state, without reserve, that our country and Government firmly and fully believe in the right of our compatriots in Goa to free themselves from alien rule and to be reunited with the rest of the motherland. This will serve the cause of friendship and understanding, even as the freedom of India has led to friendly relations between the United Kingdom and India. We would therefore invite the Portuguese Government to co-operate in the peaceful consummation of these endeavours.

The position in respect of the French Settlements happily affords at present a different and more hopeful picture. I believe we may reasonably feel that we are nearing the consummation of our hopes of a peaceful and lasting settlement, arrived at by conciliation and consent, honourable and satisfactory to all concerned. Exchanges of views and ideas between ourselves and the Government of France have been in progress for some time and they are being pursued with goodwill on both sides. The Prime Minister of France has demonstrated to the world his patriotism and political boldness as well as his desire for peaceful settlement by negotiation. I have every hope that we shall before long witness the solution of this problem in the context of the full freedom of our people and of firmer friendship between India and France.

The present phase of this problem is, as I have said,

hopeful, but it has not always been so. The exercise of patience and our firm desire to reach settlement by negotiation has justified itself. The House will perhaps allow me to say that this policy of acting with patience and prudence, in accordance with the principles we hold, does justice to ourselves and also yields results.

FOREIGN FOOTHOLDS

YESTERDAY I made a statement before the House outlining the policy that Government was pursuing in regard to Goa. I must express my deep gratitude to Members who have spoken in this House today of their broad appreciation of this subject and their general acceptance of the policy of Government. There have been some criticisms, but, on the whole, the area of agreement is very large and the area of disagreement limited and narrow.

There is no one in this House who requires any argument in justification of India's claim to Goa. It is obvious. There is hardly any question that has come before this House which had such unanimous approval or agreement. The only questions that have arisen are as to the steps that might be taken to give effect to India's claim. Even there, so far as I can understand, it is by and large the opinion of this House that the methods should be peaceful.

Now, although it does not require that anything should be said in justification of our claim to Goa, I shall, nevertheless, venture to mention a few facts, perhaps more for the benefit of others than for Members of this House. There is of course the geographical argument. The Portuguese Government claims that Goa is a part of Portugal. That remark is so illogical and absurd that it is rather difficult to deal with. You are suddenly transported into a land where logic does not prevail. To say that Goa is a part of Portugal is something in

the nature of a fairy tale or nursery rhyme about the cat jumping over the moon. It has no relation to facts, and any kind of will, decree or law passed in Portugal is not going to make Goa a part of Portugal.

Reference is made to a number of treaties, more especially to those between the United Kingdom or England as it was then, and Portugal. And there is the NATO alliance. I think it has been made fairly clear by responsible people that the NATO alliance has little relevance to this question. It has been stated that under that alliance, a subject like Goa or indeed any other subject can be brought up for discussion, but that alliance is not by any means compelled to deal with such problems or go beyond its narrower periphery of action. We may, therefore, set aside the NATO alliance.

Then there are these treaties with the various British Governments. I think the first one is dated 1374. These treaties began, as far as I can remember, with an attempt by the then King of Portugal to protect himself against the then King of Castile, that is, Spain. This was soon after the Arabs, or the Moors, as they were called, were driven out of the Iberian Peninsula; and Portugal was rather afraid of Castile which was growing in strength. Some of the later treaties were aimed against the Hollanders as they were called, or the Dutch, who were spreading out. In the course of these treaties all kinds of provisions were made about the right of Portugal to go and raise armies directly in England. A provision in one of the later treaties might interest the House :

"That His Majesty of Portugal, or anyone whom he may depute, shall be permitted to raise and procure in this Commonwealth,

that is, England,

"soldiers and horses, to defend and secure himself against the King of Castile;

"And that the military force, which he shall be at liberty to levy, shall not amount to more than 12,000, namely, 4,000 out of each of the three Nations of England, Scotland and Ireland respectively."

Then we come to that famous treaty in which the town and port of what was called Bombaine was handed over at the time King Charles II of England married the Portuguese

princess. There are all kinds of references to the port of Bombaine and Colombo, and that is the whole background. I am mentioning these rather irrelevant facts to indicate how that picture of the world completely ceased to exist many hundreds of years ago. After that, there were treaties which were several times confirmed by subsequent treaties. In the treaty by which the town and port of Bombaine was handed over, there was a secret clause. It is that secret clause to which reference is often made, as it was under that secret clause that England promised to help and protect Portugal and her colonies in 1661. It might interest the House to know that in spite of these various treaties, a little before the First World War—I think in 1912—there were actually negotiations between England and Germany for a partition of the Portuguese Empire. The negotiations led to other events including the War. But I merely mention this to indicate what value is attached to many of these ancient treaties. Of course, every constitutional lawyer and historian knows that any treaty or any agreement has to be interpreted in terms of the existing circumstances. If, for instance, Portugal, in terms of that treaty, claims today the right to raise an army directly in England, Scotland or Ireland, I have little doubt that the United Kingdom would refuse to acknowledge that fact, although it is there in the treaty. It is absurd, therefore, to talk about ancient treaties in these terms.

A treaty has to be seen in terms of the historical developments that have since taken place. So far as independent India is concerned, we are in no way bound by any old or modern treaty between other countries to which we have not subscribed, so that in no event are we concerned with the treaty between Portugal and England or other countries. But quite apart from the fact that we are not bound by them, I am trying to indicate that nobody else is bound by such ancient treaties, because they have to be construed only in the light of later developments. Some of these developments have been startling, like the independence of India. The independence of India was never conceived as the independence of a part of India, or as the independence of India excluding certain areas which may be controlled by some authority

outside India. It is inconceivable that there can be independence of India with parts of India being held by an outside authority. The House will remember that some 140 years ago, even some time after the United States had established itself as a strong nation, there was the fear of interference by European Powers in the American continents, and this led to the famous declaration by President Monroe of the United States. This was in 1823, and the declaration said :

"The United States would regard as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition to itself the effort of any European Power to interfere with the political system of the American continents."

That is to say, any interference by a European country would be an interference with the American political system. I submit that in the existing conditions—I place my case quite clearly—the Portuguese retention of Goa is a continuing interference with the political system established in India today. I shall go a step further and say that any interference by any other Power would also be an interference with the political system of India today. That need not be called a particular doctrine; it is just a statement of the present policy. It may be that we are weak and we cannot prevent that interference. But the fact is that any attempt by a foreign Power to interfere in any way with India is a thing which India cannot tolerate, and which, subject to her strength, she will oppose. That is the broad doctrine I lay down. That applies in the existing conditions to the Portuguese retention of Goa. Therefore, for a variety of reasons like national unity, national security and others I need not go into, we cannot possibly accept such interference or such foothold. When a foreign Power has that foothold, it means that it is a foothold not of that country, but a group of countries with a large number of alliances, and therefore all kinds of possible dangers and entanglements might arise.

I do submit that the case of India in regard to Goa is as clear as any case that I can think of and it should not require really any great arguments to justify it. But various types of arguments are advanced by the Portuguese Government and they are strange. Therefore, I thought I could venture to

repeat what I have said. I am not going into the old history of the Portuguese possession of Goa; but I think many Members will remember that this history is a very dark chapter of India's history. I mention it because Goa is repeatedly referred to as a shining light of European culture. Opinions may differ on what European culture is. But I should like to put it to Europe and to the countries of Europe, whether they regard the culture represented by Goa today, or even by Portugal, as European culture at its highest and brightest.

The religious argument has been employed. Hon. Members belonging to the Roman Catholic Church have spoken today in this House, and Catholics have spoken elsewhere. I do not think anything that will happen in Goa is going to affect our broad policy in regard to religious freedom. Hon. Members know how many Catholics have taken part in this struggle of freedom in Goa.

Therefore, let us be clear. From any point of view, there can be only one decision of this question and that is, merger with the Indian Union. One hon. Member said the fact of Goa being part of the Indian Union is not an arguable point. We do not go and discuss with the Portuguese Government whether Goa is to be part of the Indian Union or not. The only thing that we can discuss with them—I have no doubt the time will come when it will be discussed—is the manner of doing it, the legal or other steps that have to be taken. Our approach throughout has been, in the case of both French possessions and Portuguese possessions in India, that the other party should recognize this basic fact, and also tell us that *de facto* they are part of India. We do not mind if there is some delay. We are prepared to accommodate the other Government concerned in these matters. But, where the basic right is denied, there is no question of argument. Any argument or any negotiation with Portugal denying that right is not possible.

There is another point that I wish to make clear. When we say that this is a matter of special concern to the Goans, it does not mean that the matter is of less concern to other Indians. What was said was in connection with certain types

of movement and agitation that were going on. The future of Goa, that is, the union of Goa with India, is a matter of special, intense, equal concern to every Indian including every Goan.

We now turn to the question of what are the methods to be employed. Acharya Kripalani put a straight question: whether our Government was pledged to non-violence. The answer to that is no, the Government is not. As far as I can conceive, under the existing circumstances, no Government can be pledged to non-violence. If we were pledged to non-violence, surely we would not keep any Army, Navy or Air Force—and possibly not even a police force. I do not know. One may have an ideal. One may adhere to a policy leading in a certain direction and yet, because of existing circumstances, one cannot give effect to that ideal. We have to wait for it for some time. Acharya Kripalani reminded us of Mahatma Gandhi, saying that the Polish defence against the German armies might also be called satyagraha. Also Gandhiji defended—not only defended but in fact encouraged—the Indian Army going to Kashmir to defend Kashmir against the raiders. It is surprising that a man like Gandhiji, who was absolutely committed to non-violence, should do that kind of thing. So that, even he, in certain circumstances, admitted the right of the State, as it is constituted, to commit violence in defence. The Government of India, obviously, cannot give up that right in the existing circumstances. Nevertheless, we have made it perfectly clear that we shall use force only in defence and that we shall not provoke a war or start a war or adopt any aggressive tactics in regard to a war. That is our policy.

Some hon. Members opposite talked about a limited war. Goa no doubt is small and India is big, but the idea of a limited war ignores the fact that the world is much more of a unit today, and far more in favour of peace, than it ever was before. I do not say that it is impossible for India or some other country to have a limited war. It may yield results too. But whatever wars may have done in the past, in the present state of affairs in the world, no major war can bring the results aimed at. And if you rule out a major war, then you

have to apply the same argument to a small war. Not that a small war is in essence the same as a big war—it is not—but because a small war helps also to keep up the atmosphere which creates a big war. Here we are fighting against these vague ghosts and phantoms which create cold war—sometimes real fears, sometimes unreal fears. If we ourselves move away from that level and think in terms of some kind of police action or limited war, then we are injuring all the larger causes that we stand for, and possibly getting ourselves entangled in great difficulties.

It being admitted and settled that the policy we should pursue is a peaceful policy, it is open to us to do much in terms of that peaceful policy. Some Members referred to economic blockade. Obviously, it is open to us to pursue these policies, and many others.

Reference has been made to satyagraha—both mass satyagraha and individual satyagraha. The Government of India or any government does not talk of satyagraha in that way. An hon. Member suggested that the Government of India should lead a satyagraha movement into Goa. That, if I may say so with all respect, is a misapprehension of the functions of government, as if government was an agitational body agitating *for* somebody and *against* somebody else. No government will or can perform satyagraha. When I make that statement, naturally I am thinking of satyagraha in the normal sense. There may be some possible extensions of that move which are beyond my mind at the present moment. But satyagraha, as we know it, has been performed within our country against the governmental apparatus. But one government performing it against another government is, for the moment, not clear to me.

Therefore, let us not get things mixed up. Many hon. Members who have had the privilege of being initiated into the satyagraha movement during this Goan campaign probably have had no previous experience of it. They have not understood either the technique or the theory of it, always excluding of course some hon. Members opposite who have that knowledge.

So far as our Government is concerned, we have nothing

to do with satyagraha. That is the governmental viewpoint. Of course, there may be a public viewpoint, apart from the governmental. A party can do so; but the Government cannot conceive of patronizing satyagraha. The most it can do is not to interfere, provided the satyagraha is within certain limits, provided it is non-violent, and provided also that it does not lead to a situation of violence on a big scale. When we disapprove of mass satyagraha, it is not because mass satyagraha itself is wrong, but because the manner of conducting it is likely to lead to unforeseeable results and large-scale violence. It may cease to be satyagraha, and may be compelled to turn in some other direction. If there were an adequate number of trained satyagrahis, they might perhaps carry on even mass satyagraha in a disciplined way. The House will remember how the archpriest of satyagraha, Mahatmaji, put a full stop to the whole movement and said: "Only one man will go now." Compared to him we are novices. We cannot pretend to understand the important points of satyagraha. But one thing is clear—that if we want a settlement of this question by peaceful methods, we should not do anything which, though peaceful in itself, leads to violent methods.

There has been a so-called constitutional statute introduced or sought to be introduced by the Portuguese Government in Goa, Daman and Diu. This is being done evidently to create some impression on the people there. This constitutional statute is a very feeble attempt at local reform. It gives absolutely no authority or power. Briefly speaking, the position even after this will be that out of 23 seats in a new council which is formed under a very limited franchise, eleven will be elected, that is, less than half. And even this council will not have much power. In fact, all power will remain in the hands of a handful of officials. Oddly enough, the position in Goa not only today but even after this constitutional statute will be that they will have less freedom—if I may use the word in a limited sense—than Goa had under the monarchy in Portugal. They go backwards there. Instead of there being some advance in local reforms, opportunities have actually become more and more restricted.

I would again say that we cannot consider these matters from a purely narrow, local or even national point of view. Whether we like it or not, we have become part of an international community which is spread out all over the world. If we remember that, and if we remember that every action of ours has reactions elsewhere, just as other actions have reactions here, then perhaps we shall be able to judge these matters in the proper perspective.

NO CHANGE OF BASIC POLICY

THERE IS APPARENTLY a feeling, and newspapers in India and abroad have given expression to it, that there has been some marked or sudden change in the Government's policy in regard to Goa. It has been thought by some people, more particularly, I think, by some foreign observers, that we have made this change because of foreign opinion or foreign reactions. We are interested in foreign reactions, not only about this matter, but about every other matter, because we want to be wide awake and not isolated. But I should like to make it clear that whatever decisions we have arrived at have been completely internal decisions in our attempt to follow the policy which we consider right. Nothing that has happened or is being said in foreign countries has in the slightest affected or brought about the decisions we have made.

Next, I would venture to point out to the House that there has been no reversal of policy and that we have consistently followed the same policy throughout and more especially in the course of the last year or more since certain developments took place. It is true, however, that there has been sometimes a variation in emphasis and at some periods a certain laxity in enforcing that policy.

What are the basic elements of our policy in regard to Goa? First, there must be peaceful methods. This is essential

From speech in Lok Sabha initiating debate on the international situation, September 17, 1955

unless we give up the whole roots of all our policies and our behaviour. There is nothing I can argue with any person who thinks that the methods employed in regard to Goa must be other than peaceful, because we rule out non-peaceful methods completely.

We have taken into consideration not only what happened in Goa but what happened subsequently in the City of Bombay and elsewhere—the indiscipline and the methods other than peaceful which came into evidence and which were the very reverse of the peaceful atmosphere so necessary for a satyagraha. One cannot have it both ways. Either one adopts military methods or police action or one keeps to peaceful methods. To mix them up is to fall between two policies, and to be nowhere.

There are many Members in this House whose experience goes back over the last 35 years of India's history. Under a great leadership, the national movement in India pursued peaceful methods, and whenever we slipped—and we slipped sometimes—the movement was stopped utterly and absolutely. It was felt by our leader that we must be true to our principles and to our policy, and that nothing would be achieved by indiscipline and by straying from the basic policy in excitement or anger.

Secondly, it has throughout been emphasized that there should be no mass entry into Goa, or, no satyagraha in the form of mass entry. Thirdly, we have said the satyagraha should be predominantly the business of Goans. That was first stated about a year ago, but gradually a number of non-Goan Indians, a relatively small number to begin with, have participated in the groups that have gone to Goa. The groups were small and the Indians were relatively few. It is true we may be criticized for having allowed this thing to continue, but I must say there was no vital principle involved. If we are asked why we did not deny to non-Goan Indians the right to join it, I would say Indians have every right to work for the freedom of Goa or, for that matter, for the freedom of the North Pole if they want to. Why should I impose a ban? If such work comes in the way of my policy, I might stop it for that reason, but I do not wish to deny the right

in theory. We thought that the participation of non-Goan Indians in the so-called satyagraha in any large numbers would produce wrong results and therefore we expressed ourselves against it. When one or two Indians went in, it was not a matter of great significance. In July the number of Indians increased somewhat. Early in August, a week before August 15, we were in some doubt as to what action, if any, we should take, because we saw some developments which were not in keeping with the policy we had laid down. The policy all along, even at the end of July, had been that there should be no mass entry and the emphasis should be on Goans and not Indians, though there was no strict and rigid barrier against individual Indians going there. But the new developments caused us much concern. We knew that large numbers of enthusiastic countrymen and countrywomen of ours were going to Goa in a spirit of self-sacrifice and a desire to help in the freedom of Goa. Whatever our policy and theirs, there was no question of our not appreciating the individual motives of the people who went there. That is why on the morning of August 15, when I was speaking from the ramparts of the Red Fort here, I said that my mind and heart were full of thoughts for those people on the Goa border. My mind was full of what happened and what might happen to our people doing a brave act, facing a danger. Whether I agree or disagree with their motives, my mind and heart will go out to brave men facing danger for a cause. But I was concerned about the consequences. We may perhaps be justifiably asked why we allowed matters to go thus far on August 15. I quite frankly say that my mind was not clear. I was not clear whether, having gone that far, we should suddenly ask these people who had collected or were collecting in large numbers for mass entry, not to do so. After the happenings of August 15 in Goa, all of us had to give a great deal of intense thought to this position, and as a result of that very careful and anxious consideration, we came to the conclusion that we must lay stress on our basic policies in regard to Goa, and not allow any doubt about that policy. It may be justifiably said against us that we were not quite clear, not about the basic policy, but about certain develop-

ments, and certain minor aspects of that policy and therefore the people were in doubt as to our policy. We felt that it was not right or fair to the public or to ourselves that we should leave scope for the slightest doubt; and we therefore came to the conclusion, in the present context, that no satyagraha, even individual satyagraha, should be permitted. It is obvious that I am not speaking on grounds of principle but practical considerations. After a big-scale effort had been made on August 15, going back immediately to individual efforts would have no particular meaning, moral or physical. Hon. Members may have read in the newspapers how the Portuguese have started describing some people as "violent satyagrahis". I do not know anything about them. I believe there are some small groups in Goa itself which may have indulged in acts of sabotage like damaging a small bridge and so on.

I am asked, "What is the alternative to this kind of satyagraha?" In answer, I shall also ask: "What exactly do you seek to achieve by the particular methods that you may suggest?" Obviously, problems of this kind do not yield themselves to some sudden, magic remedy. But, as the House knows, we have taken a large number of measures, economic, financial and other, which, I have no doubt, are effective to a considerable extent. Their effectiveness grows with other measures that we may take. These are the normal ways of approaching this problem. Remember that in our consideration of the entire question we are ruling out what is called military or police action. But I have no doubt in my mind that the steps we take must necessarily end in the liberation of Goa from the Portuguese. I cannot fix a date, even as no person can fix a date for the solution of any of the world's problems, such as Germany, the Far East, Indo-China or Africa. The main thing is that the policies pursued should be on the right lines. Right conduct must necessarily lead to right results, just as wrong conduct leads to evil results.

In Goa, we have a remarkable picture of the sixteenth century facing the twentieth century, of a decadent colonialism facing a resurgent Asia, of a free and independent India being affronted and insulted by the Portuguese authorities, of, in fact, Portugal functioning in a way which, to any

thinking person, is so amazing in its incongruity in the modern world that he is a little taken aback.

We have watched with interest the reactions of foreign countries to what is happening in Goa. Goa is a symbol of decadent colonialism trying to hold on. It is something more : it has become an acid test by which we can judge of the policies of other countries. Does any country actively support or encourage Portuguese intransigence in Goa? If so, we know, broadly speaking, where that country stands in world affairs. Or are there any countries that, without positively and actively encouraging Lisbon, passively support or acquiesce in this position? We know how they stand. And lastly, do those other countries realize that Portuguese domination in Goa cannot and must not continue, not only for normal reasons and causes, but because it has become an affront to civilized humanity, more especially after the brutal and uncivilized behaviour of the Portuguese authorities there?

I submit, therefore, to this House that the policy which Government has laid down in regard to Goa is not only a sound policy, but the only possible policy. Minor variations may take place from time to time, but the major roots of that policy must hold good. I submit that this policy fits in with our larger world policy as well as our national outlook, and is a policy which will yield results too. It is not a mere idealistic policy, but a practical policy. I trust, therefore, that any doubts about this matter would be removed from the minds of not only Members here but those outside, and they will realize that we have followed a consistent policy through this last year. We probably allowed the situation to drift a little, but the moment we saw that it was taking us in a wrong direction, we pulled ourselves up. I think the country and the Government have shown courage in this matter, to ourselves and to the world. I should like it to be clearly understood by people outside India that this does not mean the slightest slackening by our Government in regard to Goa. All the world knows, and I am quite certain that people in Portugal know, that it is inevitable that Goa has to come to India. If in the normal course this takes a little time, it does not matter much. There are many problems which take time. As the House knows,

there are bits of Portuguese-dominated territory in China and in Indonesia. The People's Government of China does not get terribly excited about Macao being Portuguese. Macao will go to them; there is no doubt about it. But they do not get excited. They are not weak in their military power. It is a small matter for them if they choose to take it, but they do not choose to take it because of their larger policies. It would not matter normally to us if Goa's coming to us takes a little more time, but the course of events has made Goa an important and vital issue. To some extent the iron has entered our souls over this issue. We have therefore to deal with it with all the wisdom and strength that we possess and not allow it to become a static question. I hope that people in other countries will realize this.

FROM THE VERY OUTSET our policy, both at home and abroad, has been to solve all problems peacefully. If we ourselves act against that policy we would be regarded as deceitful hypocrites. It would be said that we say one thing and do another. If it is proved that we have no principles and that we are opportunists, what would be the result? The high reputation that we enjoy in the world today and the weight that our words carry are due to the fact that we adhere to and honour our principles. If we suddenly reverse our policy, the world will get an opportunity to say that we are deceitful, that we indulge in tall talk but that when the time for action comes, we swing to whichever side is winning and at the crucial hour fail miserably.

Shri Deshpande said that most of the people who offered satyagraha believed or were told that they would be backed by the Indian Army. You will realize that if that be the position, the whole complexion of satyagraha is changed. What is satyagraha? It is the fight of the spirit of man against material might. It is a weapon which is very powerful and effective. It causes the enemy to retreat. The satyagrahi is

even prepared to lay down his life. The philosophy of satyagraha makes the people brave and courageous and demoralizes the opponent. But when the satyagrahis know that they are backed by the Army, the nature of the entire situation changes and it no longer remains satyagraha.

Shri Chatterjee remarked that the fight for Goa could be finished in a day or two, perhaps in a few hours. It is true that if there were a fight, it would be over in two or three days, irrespective of whether the Portuguese in Goa have 12,000 or 24,000 troops. It is possible that they may inflict still further sufferings on the people whom they are holding down. It has been stated by some Members opposite that after all it will be a minor fight, and that since Goa is small, it will be a petty affair. I want to emphasize, however, that it is a matter of principle. If the points of the Opposition Members were conceded, it would boil down to this: that the big countries of the world have a right to bring the smaller countries under their sway. That is a wrong stand. Once we accept the position that we can use the Army for the solution of our problems, we cannot deny the same right to other countries. It is a question of principle.

When our decision was announced it caused surprise to some people in the beginning. Tandonji has advised us to adopt a middle course between the stand taken by me and that taken by other persons. As far as I think, we have not changed our view to any great extent, though I concede that even a small change on certain occasions appears to be big. The fact is that the events, the newspaper reports and the statements made by several people had created such an atmosphere in the country that what we said went against that prevailing atmosphere. The people were surprised on that account and not because of our decision itself, for it was in no way against our earlier stand. The people were surprised and some of them were even shocked; but those who thought over it coolly came to the conclusion that it was a right and correct decision. Several Members of the parties opposite also came to this conclusion. They were, however, not prepared to admit it publicly.

Supposing the Government had maintained the previous

stand, that is, allowed satyagraha to be offered by a few people from time to time, what would have been the result? What would have those people done, and how long would they have continued it? Several such questions would have confronted us. The question whether our Army should also follow in their wake in any given case or circumstances would also have arisen.

Some people have repeatedly demanded that we should give an ultimatum and fix a target date. We are at this time faced with several great problems in the world—the problems of Taiwan, of Indo-China, of Germany and of Morocco. I am not aware if an ultimatum of that kind has been given anywhere. And who should deliver it to whom and what does an ultimatum signify? Ultimately we come round to the proposition that if the ultimatum is not complied with, the Army has to be sent. It would then mean that the satyagraha was being used as a screen and there was talk of military action and police action behind it. The question also arises what after all is satyagraha. I have stated elsewhere that the ideology of satyagraha is dynamic, but that sufficient research has not been conducted into its nature. How far can it go and what are the limits beyond which it cannot go? I for one cannot answer that question. I can, however, say that at any rate it is not appropriate at the present moment and that it would be a blunder to embark on it at this juncture, because it would be harmful for the country.

You should also take into account the policy and methods followed by Dr. Salazar and his Government; keeping them in view you should consider how far satyagraha against such a Government and such a person can prove successful. Hence I would respectfully submit that the resolution was passed by us after great deliberation. I repeat that there is no difference in our previous policy and the present policy, unless it be a very minor difference in emphasis only. Previously we were lax, but later on we thought that this laxity should be ended. Shri Chatterjee has remarked that we have shown weakness and cowardice and that we did not have the courage to send our Army there. I wish to state that the decision taken by us called for much greater mental courage.

ON EDUCATION AND CULTURE

ENRICHING THE LANGUAGES

SEVERAL MEMBERS have referred to the controversies and conflicts we have in the matter of languages. But the remarkable thing is that there is so little of controversy and conflict. I want you to appreciate how remarkable it is that over a question which raises not only heated argument but passion, there is so much common ground in India.

There are bound to be different approaches to a question of this kind. But I would beg of everyone to remember that while there should be argument, there should be no controversy of the aggressive and bitter type. I have no doubt that if we approach this question with hostility towards each other, we shall not be advancing the cause we seek to advance. It is not a question that can be decided by a majority of votes. A certain atmosphere must be created in the country which will be favourable to the growth of what we want to grow. That is important all over India, and more important in the South for various reasons. The South has widely accepted the decision in the Constitution and is generally acting up to it. It is no good for people in the North to shout too much and say that enough is not being done. If any criticism is to be made it should be made by people in the South of the South and not by people in the North of the South. I would beg all of you—and if I could address a wider audience, I would beg them too—to remember this important achievement of ours in getting this vast degree of support and agreement over a question which bristles with difficulties.

Wherever this question of language has arisen, there has been difficulty. Languages cannot be put over by compulsion

Speech at a meeting of the Congress Party in Parliament, New Delhi, May 7, 1954

on large numbers of people; it can be done only by agreement, only by consent.

I had a long talk today with two eminent persons from Yugoslavia. One of them is an ex-Minister of the Government, and he started asking me about the language question in India. I told him something about it, and then I asked him about his country. As you perhaps know, there are three major languages in Yugoslavia and two scripts. All the three languages are official, national languages in both the scripts. Every law, every official document, is printed in two scripts and three languages. One of the languages, Serbian, is the dominant language in the sense that more people speak it and use it and it may in the course of time dominate the others. But the ex-Minister told me they had taken great care that it should not even appear that Serbian was the chief language and the others were not as important. The medium of instruction, he said, was invariably the language of the area, whether it was Macedonian, or any other. I asked him whether they did not make Serbian compulsory in all the areas. He said, "No, we don't even make it compulsory as a second language, because we want to create an impression of full freedom for every language to develop. As a matter of fact, Serbian does gain." I asked him whether they had examinations in all the languages or in only one for the people who went into the services. He said there was no compulsion and they passed the examinations in their own languages.

I do not believe there is any great difference among the three languages of Yugoslavia. Probably they are languages as closely related as Gujarati, Marathi and Hindi; nevertheless, they are different languages. The Yugoslav ex-Minister told me that having experienced a lot of conflict over other matters, they wanted to create a feeling of complete freedom in this matter. And, mind you, Yugoslavia is a Communist dictatorship, not allied to the Soviet Union, but nevertheless a Communist dictatorship. That is to say, it is an authoritarian government which can fairly easily impose its will, but wisely they have left matters to develop and they encourage all their three languages fully, not even making one of them compulsory. Educated people know all the three or know at least two.

I mention this to you to show how cautiously wise countries proceed in these matters. Likewise, we must do our utmost to encourage the regional languages and the all-India language, Hindi, but in whatever we may do, create no impression of opposition to any other. Otherwise, we immediately create difficulties for ourselves.

I repeat that the principal thing to remember is the vast amount of agreement on this issue. For a country so large as India, and with so many languages, this is a feat unparalleled in history. Let us therefore look at the problem in its proper perspective, bearing in mind the measure of agreement and not disagreement.

Whatever step we may take, we must not even create an impression that we are handicapping any people in the South. It is important, because what really troubles people is a feeling that they might be handicapped in service, in business, in politics or in Parliament, if some language which they cannot adequately master or adequately know is made the passport to further success and advancement. That is the real fear at the back of the minds of people. You must remove that fear.

Another thing which is highly gratifying to me and to my colleagues is that the two resolutions passed by the Working Committee a month or six weeks ago have had a larger measure of approval and support than any other resolutions of the Working Committee that I can remember. That again shows the wide measure of agreement in the country.

We have to be careful. Let us, as I said, constructively think of developing Hindi and the regional languages. Hindi has to be thought of in two ways, as a regional language on exactly the same footing as other regional languages, and, separately, as an all-India language, official or otherwise. The two approaches are somewhat different, although they overlap. As a regional language you want Hindi to have the richness of a regional language. If you want to impose that richness on the all-India language, you make it too difficult for the others. A person from South India who has learnt Hindi as an all-India language can easily develop more knowledge of it, but the first thing is to make him feel at ease

in the official and other work that he does, whether in Parliament or in the Congress or anywhere else. He can then, if he wishes, proceed to know Hindi as a rich and developed language without any compulsion.

Many people think of trying to make the all-India language a kind of amalgam of various languages. That is desirable to some extent but there is a grave danger that if you make it an amalgam, it may very well become a bazar language and not a literary language at all. It may lose all the vitality which a language has to have because you take a word from here and a word from there and mix them together. A living language is always a bit of an amalgam, of course, but it is an amalgam of its own making. This absorption should be spontaneous. It should not be done in the manner of some experts who make a list of words by choosing them from here and there and then pushing them in. Such words may be excellent, logically speaking, but they are not natural growths of the language.

Let Hindi be developed as a regional language and made as rich as possible; but let a simpler form of Hindi be specially developed for all-India purposes for people to know easily. Let it consist of five thousand words, let us say, or six thousand or ten thousand words which would be quite enough for normal communication.

I repeat again that the whole approach should be a positive, constructive approach, not a destructive and hostile approach. The real difficulty is in the South; South India should not feel that it is going to be handicapped because of Hindi being made the all-India language. I see no reason why they should feel that way if we proceed properly. It is not a question of our logically laying down something; it is a question of their believing that they are not handicapped.

The one test of a language—I think Dr. Raghu Vira used the word—is: does it help in the advance of knowledge? Dr. Raghu Vira yesterday said much out of his deep knowledge of this subject which must help all of you to consider it in its various aspects. There is one aspect which always occurs to me when any expert, and more especially a linguistic expert, is talking. It is just like a botanist who will tell you the names

—Latin or Sanskrit—of flowers without perhaps understanding the flower itself. You know those simple lines :

A primrose by the river's brim
A yellow primrose was to him
And it was nothing more.

But what Dr. Raghu Vira said was very much to the point in the consideration of this problem. It would be as wrong for us to talk of adopting international phraseology in a wholesale way as to talk of rejecting it. The question has to be considered not only from the scientific and logical point of view but also from the point of view of practicality.

There is a certain advantage in adopting what is called the international terminology for the next ten years or so while dealing with scientific and technical terms, always subject to the proviso that we do not adopt it wholesale. Within the confines of India, whatever scientific and technical terms are adopted should be common, as far as possible. Let us leave out what the French and German languages do with regard to Latin, but in India at least we should try to develop a common technical and scientific phraseology for the languages of India. It will be a great nuisance and burden if we differed even here.

Shri Gadgil said that his test was what was easily acceptable to the people. That is a very good test, but it will not help when applied to technical terms. Such terms have to be decided by the experts. We talk about advancing the cause of Hindi in various ways. The fact is that languages are advanced by many national activities. Among the most powerful factors advancing the cause of Hindi today are the films and the radio. More and more people are seeing Hindi films not only in India, but even outside India, in East Africa and elsewhere. Hindi gradually gets down to the people through them.

I shall sum up the points that must be kept in mind. The first is that we should remember what a large measure of agreement there is. Secondly, remembering that agreement, we should approach the other problems, whether of enriching Hindi or developing the content of the all-India language. Due importance must always be given to all the regional languages of India.

It is not a question of Hindi being, let us say, better than Bengali or Tamil. Not at all; the sole question is that from a practical point of view Hindi is the only possible all-India language. Tamil might be a better and a richer language. This is not a matter for us to argue about. I do not know all the languages and I cannot say which is better, but I do know that Tamil is a great language, that Bengali is a great language, and that other languages in India are also great. There is no question of Hindi being better; but in the circumstances it is the only suitable all-India language.

All our regional languages will grow. It is not ultimately by the lexicographer that a language is made. After all language gives clothing to concepts and ideas. If our writers and poets, essayists and novelists, historians and biographers have ideas, they will find adequate expression in language. You cannot create ideas by an empty word. Words are powerful because they represent the power of ideas. Amazing power the word has. If it is a good word, it survives.

TRAINING THE MOTHER

IT SEEMS TO ME that while the progress of women's education is forging ahead at such a pace, some attention may also be paid to men's education. Truly no argument is required in defence of women's education. For my part, I have always been strongly of the opinion that while it may be possible to neglect men's education it is not possible or desirable to neglect women's education. The reasons are obvious. If you educate the women, probably men will also be affected thereby, and in any event children will be affected. For every educationist knows that the formative years of a person's life are the first seven or eight years. We talk about schools, and colleges which are no doubt important, but a person is more or less made in the first ten years of his or her life. Obviously,

Speech at the laying of the foundation tablet of a women's college at Teynampet, Madras, January 22, 1955

in that period, it is the mother who counts most of all. Therefore the mother who has been well trained in various ways becomes essential to education. Most mothers, trained otherwise, I regret to say, are not good mothers. They are too soft. They stuff their children with all kinds of eatables, put too many clothes on them, wrap their necks and heads and ears with all kinds of woollen apparel and make the boy or girl almost an imbecile before he or she grows up. Therefore, it is necessary for women to be educated, if not for themselves, at any rate for their children.

A great French writer once remarked : "If you want me to tell you what a nation is like, or what a social organization is like, tell me the position of women in that nation." The status and social place of women will indicate the country's character more than anything else. That applies equally to the educational, social, economic and other fields.

The idea that women should be kept away from most occupations no longer finds favour. It might be that certain occupations are not suited for women, but that is a different matter. There are plenty of occupations which they could engage in and which they do engage in. If we analyse the matter carefully, we shall find that the average woman in India works in the field. In fact both man and woman work in the field. It is only when one gets to the middle class that the question of distinction arises. The great majority of our women have to work because economic circumstances compel them to work. Unfortunately, the idea has been prevailing—I am glad to see that it is rapidly fading—that the less work one does the higher is one's status in society. Thus the person who never works at all has the highest status. In my own part of the country, you can see a woman working hard in the field or elsewhere with her menfolk, but when the husband begins to earn more, people seem to think that she should retire into *purdah*. Doing no work is considered a sign of high status. The whole conception behind this business is totally unsuited to our times. Of course, in my part of the world, there are strange stories which some of you may have heard about what the Begums of Oudh used to do or what people thought they ought to have done. They were so delicately

nurtured, it seems, that whenever they saw an orange at a distance they caught a cold. It is said that when a doctor, or *hakim* was called in, he was not supposed to feel the pulse in the normal way. Apart from being improper it was thought it might hurt the ladies' gentle wrists if the doctor touched them. So it was arranged that a slender thread should run from the wrist to the doctor who should feel the thread and read the pulse. That might have been a good way of proceeding in the matter, because most of these women were neurotics and required no treatment. And so it did not matter what their pulse said.

That age is past and everybody, man or woman, has got to be physically good and strong and mentally alert, and do creative, productive work. A time is going to come when people will not tolerate a person who does no work. Therefore, apart from the intrinsic desirability of education, people should have education in sheer self-defence, whether it be defence as a nation against other nations of the world or within the nation itself. Of course, I admit as Prime Minister—and I am sure my colleague, the Minister for Education, Maulana Azad, will also admit it—that it should be the duty of the State to provide education at all levels to everybody. I hope a time will come when that will be done. Right now, however, we are struggling against difficulties of finance. Education is of basic importance, of course; but at the same time it is tied up with the productive capacity of the nation. To increase the productive capacity many things of basic importance have to be done. We have to decide which problem is to be given priority of treatment and draw up a balanced system of priorities. Obviously, in every system, education has to be given a very high place. The problem now is what type of education it should be and also how far we should go in for expensive buildings. Some of the expensive buildings which have been put up for village schools in North India are ugly, futile and in every sense bad. High structures are put up and charged for by the P.W.D. when a neat cottage would be infinitely more graceful and useful besides being inexpensive.

We have wrong ideas about many things and sometimes

suffer from what may be called the Anglo-Indian conception of things. I am not using the expression in the racial sense but am referring to the mixture of conceptions arising from the impact of the English mind in India. In architecture, housing and other matters, we seem to have lost our foothold, more or less having lost faith in our own conceptions. We have accepted many Western ideas, which were partly imposed on us regardless of the fact that India is a country entirely different from England, climatically and otherwise. Of course, the English rulers did not worry much about these matters. They also felt that imperial *izzat* required that they should impose their own conception of things, buildings and the rest of it, even in a small place. But that was really our fault and not the fault of Englishmen. However, the fact remains that we have inherited all kinds of astonishing ideas about buildings and the rest. I am quite sure that education will advance rapidly if we simplify our ideas about buildings and spend more on education and less on bricks. I am all for dignified buildings for educational institutions. I believe that good buildings do produce a strong impression on the person concerned. I do not want shabby, shoddy structures; we should put up dignified, solid buildings, but, meanwhile, if we are to make progress, let us spend what we have on education and its content, rather than on brick and mortar.

I am very happy to be here and I am happy to be able to participate in this function. Only yesterday, Shri Basheer Ahmed wrote to me a 'private and confidential' letter. Let me whisper it to you: he said in his letter that education among Muslim women was very backward here and that I should say something to push it forward. Certainly I am prepared to say a great deal. In fact, whatever I have been saying is meant to stress that aspect. Whatever group or religion one might belong to, education is essential. By education I mean education and not merely learning to be lady-like. Learning to be lady-like may be good in itself but it is not education as such. Education has mainly two aspects, the cultural aspect which makes a person grow, and the productive aspect which makes a person do things. Both are essential. Everybody should be a producer as well as a good

citizen and not a sponge on another person even though the other person may be one's own husband or wife. That is the way we are developing and persons who do not wake up to this fact and prepare themselves for it will just be left behind. So it is highly necessary that we should develop our education among our girls more especially, because men are provided for to some extent. There are still inhibitions in the case of Muslim girls' education and these should be removed, because, apart from any other big reason, common sense tells us so.

BASIC EDUCATION

I AM PROPOSING the following resolution on basic education :

“Far-reaching changes in the existing educational system are absolutely essential for achieving the national aims and social objectives of free India and, in particular, to train the right type of personnel for the speedy execution of the development plans. The Congress welcomes the scheme of the Ministry of Education for reorganization of secondary education, particularly the decision to establish multi-purpose schools throughout the country to give adequate and basic training to students for specific vocations in life, as well as for proceeding to higher educational courses.

“The Planning Commission and the Government of India have already accepted the policy of introducing basic education as the future pattern of primary as well as secondary education in India, since basic education uses the medium of productive activity and correlates academic subjects to different castes, and to the social environment it is evidently suitable for the needs and conditions of India. The Congress calls upon all the State Governments to further as early as possible this policy so as to implement it fully in both rural

Address at the Avadi Session of the Indian National Congress, January 23, 1955.

and urban areas in a systematic and well-planned manner within a period of ten years."

Looked at purely from the educational point of view any modern educationist is bound to accept this basic method of education, and yet unfortunately, and to my great surprise, some educationists in our country have criticized it and have said that this is a throw-back to some primitive stage of education. I can only say that they have not taken the trouble to understand what basic education is. Further, they have not quite understood what India is aiming at today. The old style of education, it is well known, was originally started by the British a century and a half ago with the particular purpose of getting a number of Indians trained to help them in the administration of the country in the lower grades. It is true that our education has progressed since then and it is also true that even under the old style of education India produced some fine specimens of humanity. That does not argue that it was the perfect type of education.

Given opportunities, India can produce hundreds of thousands of absolutely first-class people in various branches of work and knowledge. But the people do not have these opportunities. Nothing saddens me so much as the sight of children who are denied education, sometimes denied even food and clothing. If our children today are denied education, what is our India of tomorrow going to be? It is the duty of the State to provide good education for every child in the country. And I would add that it is the duty of the State to provide free education to every child in the country. Unfortunately, we cannot do all these things quickly and suddenly, because of our lack of resources and lack of teachers. But we have to get going. After all, whatever pattern of society we are looking forward to must contain trained human beings, not people who have just learned to read and write, but trained people whose character has been developed, whose mind has aspirations and some elements of culture about it and who can do something with their hands. Unfortunately, in our country, there has been a tradition that manual labour is something bad and degrading and meant only for the lower-class people. I doubt if anything has done

more harm to India that this peculiar and fantastic notion that manual labour is meant only for the lower-class people and that the upper-class person should not use his hands but should do what is called mental or intellectual work. That idea still persists. I can only describe it as a wrong and pernicious idea. I do not think that any nation which thinks that way can really progress. Manual work is essential even from the point of view of physical development, apart from anything else.

I claim to have good health and I am prepared to meet anybody of my age—in most contests, physical or other. If they want to run a hundred yards, I will run with them; or if they want to swim I will swim with them; if they want to ride, I will race with them on horseback. I may not be quite so active and agile as I was ten, twenty or thirty years ago; nevertheless, if I may take you into my confidence, I have always attached a good deal of importance to the body. It is everybody's duty to be fit and strong. I have always had an acute dislike for illness or feebleness. I do not sympathize with anybody's illness. I say so because many people here think that it is aristocratic to be ill and feeble. I want young people and old to be healthy and strong and agile, and I want them to be physically an A-1 nation. I do not think we can really make much intellectual progress unless we have a good physical background.

This type of education which presumes to concern itself only with the reading of books is from any point of view incomplete. You may become a distinguished mathematician or an eminent individual otherwise, but you will find you will be an even better mathematician if your body functions properly. I do not like persons going about with a bent back. I want them to be straight like a ramrod and walk erect. I want them to be quick in their walk and not to saunter and loiter, as many do. Basic education stresses both things—physical or cultural fitness and the ability to do things with the hands. You can take it from me that if your hands can do things, your mind will work more satisfactorily.

When we talk of basic education in this resolution we say something that is of very great importance. We say that we

require an education for the purpose of achieving the national aims and social objectives of free India. In particular we want a system which can train the right type of personnel for the speedy execution of developmental plans. After all, you want to educate a person for something. What is it? Till recently it was to get him some kind of job in Government service. Government service, no doubt, is an honourable calling. There is nothing wrong about it in free India. But obviously only a small handful can get into Government service and the vast majority of people have to do something else. They can become lawyers and the like—not if you take my advice! What is important is that each person should produce something of value to society. Each one of you consumes what society produces by way of food, clothing and so on. Unless you produce the amount you consume you are a burden to society; you are consuming something that others have produced. As a Frenchman said, you will be a thief in society and you will be stealing other people's wealth. You talk about the rich man who lives on other people's wealth; you may be right, and yet possibly the rich man may be performing an important part in society by giving his organizing capacity and so on, which somebody else may not be able to do. It is theft equally for a person who is not rich but produces nothing and lives on another person's production. We want a society in which everybody is a producer in some way or the other. Since everyone is a consumer he must be a producer also. And if he is to be a producer, and an effective producer, he must know his job well by learning it well. We want first-rate men at the top but we want everyone to be good at the particular job he does. If that is our objective, then our whole training must be aimed at that. It should be ideological training, intellectual training, as well as physical training. The whole concept of basic education is, as I understand it, that for a period of seven years everybody in India, boy and girl, between the ages of, say, seven and fourteen years, must go through this course of basic training, which must provide an adequate background for following a profession or trade. The boy or girl may at a later stage go on to higher studies. Higher studies do not necessarily mean only a degree like the

B.A. or M.A. It also means study at some kind of scientific or technical institute where one can specialize. But the seven years of basic training will be common for all. That should give the child some cultural attainments, character, and the capacity to work with his hands and to co-ordinate manual labour with mental and intellectual ability. That is the type of basic education we want. But in this resolution, what I consider very essential is pre-basic training, i.e. training of the child, almost from the very moment of its birth, in character. This is of higher importance than any training you can provide afterwards, because the child's character is largely formed in the first nine or ten years.

We have to do that for everybody in India. Basic education should be provided for every child of the school-going age. This training should be fitted into the vocations and professions of later life. After the basic stage many people may go on to acquire additional training. Or they may become good farmers, good shopkeepers or good artisans. They need not go to a college or university. But those who have the capacity should go in for higher technical training like higher scientific, engineering or medical training. The basic training and the higher training should be properly linked. The training of our youth in mind and body is a subject of the highest importance for us. We must get rid of the extraordinary notion that manual work is something degrading. There is nothing more ennobling than manual work and nothing better for physical or mental health. I place this resolution before you and I hope and trust that our State Governments will take this up with speed and enthusiasm. The Central Government comes into the picture also, but nevertheless it is largely a question for the State Governments.

FILMS FOR THE PEOPLE

IT HAS ALWAYS seemed to me a sign of the remarkable synthesis which India is producing to find that the Chief Justice of a High Court is the president of our Dance and Music Academy. That is a healthy sign. Normally, there are strong barriers separating various types of activity but when even the remote recesses of the law could come into this field of dance and song, then all must be well at least with law, if not with dance and song.

I accepted this invitation many months ago with apparent hesitation, but really with considerable pleasure. One has to appear to be hesitant occasionally, not to become too cheap. But even if I had been hesitant, it would have been difficult to survive the insistence of Devika Rani. After accepting the invitation I had forgotten all about it till a few days ago when I came back from England and was reminded of it. When I heard that there was some turmoil about the Film Seminar—that some things which were done were not approved of and objected to—I really did not understand why this fuss was being made.

A number of people connected with the film industry are coming here to discuss the prospects for the industry, which is an eminently desirable thing to do. Why be afraid of what they might say? They might talk a good deal of sense, and they might talk an equal amount of nonsense. Surely they should have the right to talk nonsense as well as sense! But because of this inner ferment I was a little uneasy. I told myself I had agreed to open the Seminar knowing precious little about the history of the development of this great industry in India or elsewhere. Of course, every person who is a little wide awake knows something about it, but here I was coming to experts. What should I say to them? Fortunately, Devika Rani sent me a long note about the history of the Indian films which, in her haste, had only been revised in the first few pages. The rest was a smudge. But so great was my eagerness to learn all about this that I read through

it, the part which I could follow and the other which I could hardly understand!

Then an eminent figure in the film world, Shri Vasana, sent me some days ago a copy of the address which he proposed to deliver in this Seminar. When I heard of these controversies, I found time to read through it, although I might confess I would not have normally read it. I did not find anything terrible in it. In fact, I found it quite mild. If I had been writing something like that, I might have used stronger language in regard to various matters. That does not mean that I agree with all that Shri Vasana has said. But the point is that some subjects are raised which obviously deserve careful study and consideration. One subject in which Shri Vasana and the industry are greatly interested is the reduction or abolition of entertainment tax. About that I propose to say nothing at all, except that I am not convinced by Shri Vasana's argument. I do not see at all why entertainment should not be taxed. To what extent they should be taxed is a different matter.

Another subject which Shri Vasana has mentioned is censorship. This is a difficult subject so far as I am concerned, because I start with a certain presumption against censorship. I am, I am sorry to say, still affected considerably by old nineteenth century traditions in regard to such matters. I do not take favourably to too much restriction or too much censorship. On the other hand, it seems to me quite absurd for anyone to talk about unrestricted liberty in important matters affecting the public. Suppose, as might well happen, the production of the atomic bomb became cheaper and simpler. Are we going to allow everybody, in the name of the liberty of the individual, to carry an atom bomb with him in his pocket? Certainly not. The invoking of some high principle in favour of censorship or against it has no meaning to me except that, broadly speaking, one should not restrict and interfere. But the State has to interfere to an extent in some activities. I might mention the case, let us say, of what are called "horror comics". I had read about them and recently I saw some of these things. In fact, a very mild type happened to be sent as a birthday gift to my grandson.

Looking at it I was horrified that anyone, much less my grandson, should have that kind of literature to read. The horror comics are something which, I am absolutely clear in my mind, should be suppressed ruthlessly. They are a hundred per cent bad, and they are causing, in some countries, all kinds of sadistic impulses, like children just murdering for murder's sake, to have the pleasure of seeing a person killed. Obviously, no government or society ought to allow that kind of thing to flourish. The freedom of the individual is not involved at all. It is clear that the Government must take action to prevent something from spreading which it and society consider evil. On the other hand, it is a dangerous thing for Government to become too much of a judge even of people's morals. In between, of course, there is a large latitude or freedom for the individual to develop.

I have been connected with Government for a number of years, but those years have not completely suppressed my personality, although, I have no doubt they have had a bad effect on it. I do not take kindly to too much regulation and regimentation, or too much protocol, specially in matters which obviously are of the spirit, like music, dance and literature.

The Chairman referred to me in my capacity as the President of the Sahitya Akademi. Whether I am worthy of being there or not I do not know, but I am rather proud of being there because it is an honour to be the President of an organization which includes in its fold the eminent writers of India in various languages. As President of that Akademi I may tell you quite frankly I would not like the Prime Minister to interfere with my work. It is true that it is not always easy to draw the line between the Prime Minister and the President of the Sahitya Akademi, but that is a different matter. My point is that these creative arts must be allowed and encouraged to grow with as little interference as possible. It is only when they manifestly become a social menace or a social danger that Government must move, and move with a firm tread. People in Government like myself are apt to have a natural tendency to reform others. I know I have that strong tendency, but I try, on the individual

level at least, to restrain myself. I let myself go when I am addressing the masses, but at the individual level I do try to restrain myself. Not that there is no desire to reform and improve others, but, as one grows older and has more experience, one feels more and more that such an attempt at individual reform is rather crude; it does not really have much effect. There should be other and subtler approaches. Then, one begins to doubt whether one is after all quite right about ideas of reform. That typical missionary or crusading zeal which comes from single-mindedness becomes rather less pronounced as one grows older.

The cinema, let us remember, is one of the biggest influences in the modern world. There are many other things which influence people—books, newspapers and so on. But I think it is perfectly correct to say that the influence of the films in India is greater than the influence of newspapers and books combined. I am not at the moment talking about the quality of the influence. I suppose you thought I was being clever, but I was not! I shall explain my meaning. When I said that I was not referring to the quality, I meant that books, for instance, not newspapers so much, would obviously have a greater and deeper influence on those individuals who can take advantage of them. The cinema will not have that effect on them, nor the newspapers. In that sense, book reading is an influence powerful in its quality, provided one knew how to read and what to read. But quantitatively the number of book readers in India is pitifully and woefully small. It makes me sad to think what a small number of people in India read books, judging from sales. It is astonishing how backward our publishing business is.

Then we come to the newspapers. Again it is astonishing how small the total circulation of newspapers in each of our languages is. We have fine newspapers in various languages in India, but the total circulation of all the newspapers in India in all the languages is, compared to the population of India, still pitifully small. Do not tell me that this is due to people not being literate. It is true that the literacy figures in India are low, but in the totality, people who are literate in India are vast in number. They may be only 20 per cent of

the population but 20 per cent of the population of India is a huge number. What is it, then, that ails our writers of books, or publishers of books, or readers of books or newspapers? Why is there this hiatus? I am not going into this question. I am asking it only to make you think a little.

I come back to my statement that, by and large, the influence of the cinema in India is far greater than that of reading books or reading newspapers or reviews and periodicals. Anything that has widespread influence is of the utmost importance to society and to Government. It cannot be treated as a joke or treated as something that can be classified as bad or as good and left at that. It has to be treated realistically as something of the highest importance for the life of the country. And because it is of the highest importance, a Government must be intimately concerned about it. As I have made clear, I do not want too much Governmental interference in artistic activities. But Government must inevitably be concerned with something which has such a wide influence. Suppose our producers produced a war film which encourages the war mentality. The Government of India would come down upon it with a big thump and stop it. There is no use telling me that we are interfering with the liberty of the individual. I just do not want war propaganda in India to pervert young people's minds. So I say there are limits. There is no reason why we should quarrel about it. There must be broad agreement on the main principles of such restraint among government, society and the industry itself. There may be difference of opinion as to where the line is to be drawn.

The cinema is a big industry. I must pay tribute to those who built it up in the last twenty or thirty years, for they have built something big starting from scratch and without much assistance and produced from time to time some very notable films. The mere quantity and the fact that this development has been practically unaided are creditable to them. Many people criticize the quality of many of our films from their rather highbrow point of view. I am not very interested in melodrama. It bores me. I fall asleep. So I do not go to such films at all. But we have to meet a problem here which is not

an Indian problem alone. It is melodrama that interests large numbers of people, whether in India, England or America or elsewhere. Public taste, to some extent, moulds what is presented to it. At the same time, what is presented should mould public taste.

There is one thing, I feel, India has been lacking in, and that is children's films. Films which are really children's films are of high importance. There is a tendency in our books written for children for the author to consider himself wise and give lectures to children on how they should behave and what virtues they should develop. My own reaction as a child to such lectures, as far as I can remember, was to hit the person lecturing. That is not the way to approach children. By lecturing you inevitably drive children to evil ways. Don't sermonize too much. There are subtler ways of pointing a moral or drawing a lesson. Good children's films can be a very powerful instrument in developing the child and I hope that the Indian film industry will think of this. The Government, not with any intention to compete, is nevertheless likely to compete with private ventures in films; it might on its own produce documentaries or other specialized films, for children and others. There is no desire to compete, but the result to some extent might be a setting up of standards through a certain measure of competition.

CRISIS OF THE SPIRIT

MY FRIEND and colleague, Dinkar, has chosen a fascinating subject to write upon. It is a subject which has often filled my mind and it has coloured any writing that I have done. Often I ask myself: What is India? What is the essence of India? What are the forces that have gone to make India and how are they related to the major dominating influences of the world in the past and in the present? The subject is a

Foreword in Hindi to *SAMSKRITI KE CHAR ADHYAYA* by Ramdhari Sinha 'Dinkar', September 30, 1955

vast one and covers the entire field of human activity, not only in India but elsewhere, and I suppose no single person can do justice to it. But we can take up some particular aspects of it and try to understand them. We can at least try to understand our India, although that understanding will be limited if we do not have the wider picture of the world before us.

What is culture? I look it up in the dictionary and I find a variety of definitions. One great writer has called it "the acquainting ourselves with the best that has been known and said in the world." Another definition says that it is "the training, development or strengthening of the powers, mental or physical, or the condition thus produced; improvement or refinement of mind, morals, or tastes; enlightenment of civilization". Culture, in this sense, is something basic and international. Then there are the national aspects of culture and there can be no doubt that many nations have each developed a certain genius and individuality.

Where does India fit in? Some people have talked of Hindu culture and Muslim culture and Christian culture. I do not understand these terms, although it is true that the great religious movements have influenced the culture of a race or a nation. If I look at India, I find, as Dinkar has emphasized, the gradual growth of a composite culture of the Indian people. The origins of this culture may be traced back on the one hand to the pre-Aryan period, the civilization of Mohenjodaro, etc., and the great Dravidian civilization. On the other hand, it received a powerful impress from the Aryans who came to India from Central Asia. Subsequently, it was influenced by repeated incursions from the North-West and later by the people who came across the seas from the West. Thus, this national culture gradually grew and took shape. It had a remarkable capacity for synthesis and for absorbing new elements. So long as it did so, it was dynamic and living. In later years it lost the dynamic quality and became essentially static which led to weakness in all fields. Throughout India's history we see two sets of contradictory forces at work—those in favour of a synthesis and absorption and those fissiparous tendencies which separate. Today we face the same problem in a different context. There are

powerful forces working for unity, not only political but cultural also. There are also forces that disrupt and lay stress on separateness.

The question, therefore, for us today is not an academic one but a vital issue, on the understanding and solution of which depends our future. Normally, it is the business of the intellectuals to give a lead in dealing with such problems, but our intellectuals have failed us. Many of them do not even seem to realize the nature of this problem, others suffer from frustration and a crisis of the spirit, not knowing where to turn.

Marxism and its progeny attracted many of the intellectuals, and there is no doubt that it gave a certain analysis of historical developments which helped us to think and to understand. But even that proved too narrow a creed and, whatever its virtue as an economic approach, it failed to resolve our basic doubts. Life is something more than economic growth, though it is well to realize that economic growth is a basic foundation of life and progress. History shows us two principles at work, the principle of continuity and the principle of change. They appear to be opposed to each other and, yet, each has something of the other. We notice that we consider sudden changes in the shape of violent revolutions or an earthquake. Yet, every geologist knows that the major changes in the earth's surface are gradual, and earthquakes are trivial in comparison to them. So also revolutions are merely the outward evidence of a long process of change and subtle erosion. Thus, change itself is a continuous process, and even a static continuity must yield to gradual change so long as it is not overcome by complete stagnation and death.

There are periods in history when the processes and tempo of change are more in evidence. At other times, the appearance is much more static. The static period in the life of a nation is a period of gradual deterioration and weakness, leading to the decay of the creative arts and tendencies and often to political subjection.

Probably the most powerful cultural element in India came from the union of the Aryan with the older elements in India, chiefly the Dravidian. Out of this arose a mighty

culture, chiefly represented by our great classical language, Sanskrit. That language, though it had its origin together with old Pahlavi in a common parent in Central Asia, became the national language of India. Both the North and the South contributed to its growth. Indeed, in later days, the South played a very important part. Sanskrit became the symbol not only of our people's thought and religion but the embodiment of the cultural unity of India. Ever since the Buddha's time, it has not been the spoken language of the people and yet it continued to exercise this powerful influence all over India. Other great influences came in, which led to new avenues of thought and expression.

Geography made India, in her long past, almost a closed country. Surrounded by the sea and the mighty Himalayas, it was not easy of entry. Migrations took place in India in the course of thousands of years but probably there was no big migration of peoples after the coming of the Aryans. We must contrast this with the tremendous movement of peoples right across Asia and Europe, one tribe driving the other and changing the texture of the population. In India, after the Aryans came, these incursions were relatively limited. They produced their effect but did not change overmuch that basic population. It must be remembered, however, that there were marked changes even in India. The Scythians and the Huns and the many others who came to India later developed into branches of the Rajputs and claimed ancient lineage. The fact that India was for long a closed land gave it its peculiar character. We became as a race somewhat inbred. We developed some customs which are unknown and not understood in other parts of the world. Caste, in its innumerable forms, is a typical product of India. Untouchability, the objections to inter-dining, inter-marriage, etc., are unknown in any other country. The result was a certain narrowness in our outlook. Indians, even to the present day, find it difficult to mix with others. Not only that, but people of each caste tend to remain separate even when they go to other countries. Most of us in India take all this for granted and do not realize how it astonishes and even shocks the people of other countries.

Thus, in India, we developed at one and the same time the broadest tolerance and catholicity of thought and opinion as well as the narrowest social forms of behaviour. This split personality has pursued us and we struggle against it even today. We overlook and excuse our own failings and narrowness of custom and habit by references to the great thoughts we have inherited from our ancestors. But there is an essential conflict between the two, and so long as we do not resolve it, we shall continue to have this split personality.

In a more or less static period these opposed elements did not come into conflict with each other much. But, as the tempo of political and economic change has grown faster, these conflicts have come to be more in evidence. In the atomic age, at the threshold of which we stand, we are compelled by overwhelming circumstances to put an end to this inner conflict. To fail to do so is to fail as a nation and lose even the virtues that we have possessed.

We have to face, therefore, this crisis of the spirit in India, even as we have to face great political and economic problems. The industrial revolution is coming rapidly to India and changing us in many ways. It is an inevitable consequence of political and economic change that there should be social changes also if we are to remain as integrated human beings and an integrated nation. We cannot have political change and industrial progress and imagine that we can continue unchanged in the social sphere. The stresses and strains will be too great and if we do not resolve them, we shall crack up.

The picture of India, as we see it, in the first millennium after Christ and indeed even before that, is very different from its later appearance. We see in those early days an exuberant, vital people, full of the zest of life and adventure, carrying their message to far countries. In the realm of thought, they dared to scale the highest peaks and to pierce the heavens. They built up a magnificent language and in the realm of art, they showed creative genius of the highest order. That early period does not indicate a closed-in life or a static society. We see also then the same cultural impulses surging throughout the land of India. It was from South India that

the great colonizing expeditions went out to South-East Asia. It was also from the South that the great Bodhidharma went to China with the message of Buddhism. North and South joined in this great adventure of life, each nourishing the other.

Then come the later centuries when a process of decay sets in, visible in the growing artificiality of language and the ornateness of our architecture. Our thoughts become largely a repetition of what has been said and the creative spirit grows less and less. We become afraid of adventure either of the body or mind, and we develop the caste system and a closed-in society. We talk still, as of old, in the highest terms, but we act differently.

It is extraordinary how our professions run far ahead of our practice. We talk of peace and non-violence and function in a different way. We talk of tolerance and construe it to mean our way of thinking only and are intolerant of other ways. We proclaim our ideal to be philosophic detachment even in the midst of action, that of a *sthitaprajna*, but we act on a far lower plane and a growing indiscipline degrades us as individuals and as a community.

When the Westerners came here across the seas, the closed land of India was again thrown open in a particular direction. The modern industrial civilization gradually crept in a passive way. New thoughts and ideas invaded us and our intellectuals developed the habit of thinking like British intellectuals. That shaking up and opening out was good in its own way and it began to give us some understanding of the modern world. But it cut off these intellectuals from the mass of the people who were little affected by this new wave of thought. Our traditional thinking was displaced and those who still clung to it did so in a static and uncreative way, totally unrelated to modern conditions.

Now this faith in Western thought is itself being shaken and so we have neither the old nor the new, and we drift not knowing whither we are going. The younger generation has no standards left, nothing to direct their thinking or control their actions.

This, a dangerous situation, if not checked and improved,

is likely to lead to grave consequences. It may be that we are passing through an age of transition, political, economic and social, and these are the inevitable consequences of such a period. But in the atomic age no country is likely to be given many chances to correct itself, and failure may well mean disaster.

Even if we do not understand fully the mighty forces that are at work in the world, we must at least endeavour to understand what India is and how this nation has developed its composite personality with its many facets and yet with an enduring unity. No one section of the community in India can lay claim to the sole possession of the mind and thought of India. Each part has contributed its share in making this country what it is. If we do not understand this basic fact, we do not understand India at all and if we do not understand India, we cannot function adequately or render any effective service to this country of ours.

It is because I think that Dinkar's book will help in this understanding to some extent that I commend it and hope that many will profit from its reading.

THE SANSKRIT LANGUAGE

YOU HAVE INVITED ME from the dust and tumult of political affairs to this gathering and this occasion which takes one away to other realms and other regions of thought. I have gratefully accepted your invitation for a variety of reasons : first of all, because I have long admired this great undertaking of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute; and secondly, because this is an auspicious day for all of us in India as it is connected with Lokmanya.* We who function on the political stage gain a lot of notoriety and headlines in the

Speech at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, August 1, 1956

* Lokmanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak, whose death anniversary falls on August 1

newspapers, and it is made to appear that we are performing very important functions and that what we do is of immense significance. I do not know how far that applies to the activities of politicians. It may be that sometimes they do something important, but undoubtedly there is a habit not only here but in all countries to exaggerate the importance of the day-to-day happenings which constitute, often, the essence of political affairs. Certainly they are important; certainly they affect human destinies. Nevertheless, in a long perspective, I often wonder if we do not exaggerate them very greatly.

Here we are, meeting on this particular occasion to note the publication of some volumes of this critical edition of the *Shantiparva*. Our minds go back to this tremendous epic, the Mahabharata, and not only that book but all the background that it represents. Here is something which has outlasted kings and emperors and dynasties—I do not know for how long—and powerfully affected millions and millions of human beings. Where are all those politicians and kings and emperors who have ruled and come and gone during this period? But the Mahabharata continues as powerful as ever and I am inclined to think that the work that has been done and is now being done at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute in connection with the preparation of this critical edition of the Mahabharata, may have a greater significance in the scheme of things than much that we passing politicians of the day do. It is, therefore, an honour to me to be present here on this occasion and to be asked to announce to you the publication of these three volumes of this great work.

I often wonder which is the most important of the many things that have distinguished India in the past in its history of thousands of years. I have no doubt in my mind that it is the Sanskrit language. I think it is that which has embodied the genius of our race, the wisdom of our race and almost everything that has come out in later years can somehow be found to have sprung from that magnificent language. What is language, Sanskrit or any other language? Thought represented in words. The most powerful thing in the world is thought. But thought remaining in the region of thought is

inaccessible. It leads to nothing. It may almost be called an abortion, if I may use the phrase, although thought by itself is sometimes action also. The mere thinking is action. Thought has been and will be the greatest thing in the world, and everything else comes out of thought. But thought has to take shape in words, words of power, and in this language of our race, the most magnificent thoughts are clothed in words of power. And so, this language, out of which again came this greatest of our books, was probably the strongest cultural manifestation of the Indian people.

The Governor mentioned that the city of Poona has been a great centre of scholarship. It is so. But we know how the Sanskrit language has been nurtured in all parts of India, certainly in and round about Banaras but in the far north in Kashmir also. And even today in your library here manuscripts in the Sharda script were shown to me which came from Kashmir. Devoted service was paid there to this great language of ours. In the far south of India great scholars arose and did service to it; and so in Poona and in the east and the west. However India may have been split up in the past in terms of political entities and whatever it may have suffered through the ages, this basic language, the thoughts that it represented, the dreams of our race that it has embodied, have continued to condition all of us equally. Throughout the ages, scholars of our race in various parts of India have paid homage to it. It is extraordinary that this language (I speak with a little fear because scholars are present) which I suppose has not been a spoken language in the normal sense of being the mother-tongue of the people ever since Buddha's day, and perhaps earlier, has yet been a vital and a vivid language throughout these centuries. It is extraordinary that a language which ceases to be the language of the common people should still have the enormous vitality which Sanskrit has possessed during these thousands of years. And so, this Sanskrit language, with its offshoots, of course, the daughter languages, but even more so with the force of thought and dreams and search for truth and wisdom that it contains, has been the inheritance of not only you and me but of everybody living in this country, whether in the north, or south or west

or east. I do not know whether we have profited by it or not. Perhaps we have not profited enough, but it has been with us and it has been an essential and basic part of India and all that India has been in the past. I have no doubt that it will continue to be with us in India in the future.

We are a curious country and a curious people. Somehow the past is intertwined and mixed up with our present and somehow even the future is mixed up. And so we live in this past, present and future, all mixed up with one another. That may have some slight advantage, and it certainly has some disadvantages. The past has gone and the present is with us and we work for the future. But I have no doubt that whatever shape that future may take, one of the biggest, the strongest and the most powerful and the most valued of our legacies will be the Sanskrit language and this great epic.

I should like to pay my tribute to the work of this Institute. You have just heard Dr. Belvalkar say how people have laboured here on very little salary, very little recompense, sometimes none at all. This is true of not this Institute only. All of us know that in this city of Poona there are other institutions which have nurtured scholars of great repute who have served here not for the love of money but in the old Indian tradition of love of knowledge and love of service. In this age when money shouts a great deal and affects all of us, in this money age and money economy, it is good to remember that there are people who can give their devoted service not for money but for other purposes. Therefore I should like to pay my tribute to this Institute and other institutes which have served in this way. I do not speak, and it is not perhaps right for me to speak, as the Prime Minister, about the future of this Institute, but one thing I can assure you of, if assurance is needed, that this work will not suffer in future for lack of money. It is my honour and privilege to present to you, to present to India, and to present to the world these volumes of the *Shantiparva*.

THE PLACE OF ENGLISH

I HAVE BEEN surprised to read some comments on the speech I delivered at the recent Conference of Education Ministers. I inaugurated the Conference. I did not speak on any resolution, nor indeed did I see any resolution. I have not yet seen the precise resolution passed by the Conference, though I have heard about it.

I laid great stress in my speech on the necessity of a considerable number of our people knowing foreign languages and, more especially, English. This was in relation to our development programmes and our Second and subsequent Five-Year Plans. I pointed out that it would not be possible for us to go ahead with these plans unless there was a high standard of technical and scientific education and that this standard could not be obtained at this stage without a full knowledge of at least one foreign language. As a matter of fact, scientists in any country today have to acquire knowledge of several languages in order to keep abreast of scientific literature.

I did not say a word against Hindi. Indeed I said something in favour of it. I took it for granted that Hindi was going to function more and more as a language in our education and administration except in certain parts of India where the regional languages would be principally used. Nor did I say anything about the medium of instruction. About this, I have no doubt that it will have to be either Hindi or other regional languages.

My positive stress was on a foreign language being learnt adequately. In the circumstances in India, this foreign language would inevitably be English, though I hope that other languages such as French, German, Spanish, Russian and Chinese would also be learnt. English today is by far the most widespread and important world language and probably two-thirds of the scientific and technical books in the world are published in English.

I find that most people have no idea of what industrializa-

tion implies. We discuss the financial aspect of it and vaguely think of factories and the like growing up. But the most vital part of industrialization is the training of man-power. We want a vast number of scientists, technologists and engineers of various kinds. We also want to create a background in which these people grow. This problem of trained man-power is our major problem today and we are trying to approach it now in a systematic, integrated and comprehensive way. It is not enough to train some engineers or agricultural specialists in a few colleges. We have to think in terms of hundreds of thousands and perhaps even millions later on. In the United States, in the Soviet Union and even in China they are thinking in such large terms and actually training scientists and technicians in vast numbers.

Our whole future progress depends on this process of industrialization and the use of higher techniques. It must be remembered that it takes long to train a first-class scientist or technician. To put up a steel plant takes some years. It takes twice that time to train a metallurgist who can run that steel plant. It takes five times as much time to train a competent atomic scientist as it takes to put up an atomic reactor. We have thus today to organize training for the people required for the Second and Third Five-Year Plans. We cannot delay this, or else our planning and industrial progress will be automatically held up.

It is obvious that this high-class training cannot be given today and for some years to come without knowledge of a foreign language. It is possible and indeed desirable to give elementary scientific and technological training in Hindi or our other regional languages. We can translate some textbooks as we have actually done. We can build up our technical terms in Hindi, as we are doing. But we cannot produce the vast and complicated thought that lies behind this technical and industrial age by translating a few books or having a list of terms. Changes in technology today are so rapid that even books that are being printed get out of date very soon. Every scientist has to keep up to date by reading many scientific and technical periodicals, usually in several languages.

For this and other reasons, it seems to me essential for us to continue in a big way adequate teaching of English as a second language. I say English because that is the easiest foreign language for us to learn and is the most important. We should learn other foreign languages also.

Personally I think that even from the cultural point of view in addition to the point of view of developing and widening the scope of Hindi and our other languages it is necessary for us to keep in intimate touch with, and have adequate knowledge of, foreign languages. Only thus can the stream of thought come to us from various parts of the world. This will enrich Hindi and gradually make it a vehicle of this new thought which will go to other countries, possibly through Hindi.

I fear that many of our people have little conception of the world we live in—this world of automation and atomic energy. We are living through a period of revolution and we have to face a struggle for survival for our country and not merely for achieving a somewhat higher standard. We go down if we cannot keep pace with these technological developments and indeed try to go ahead of other countries.

This is one aspect of the problem. The other, and I think an equally important one, is for us to develop Hindi and our other languages. I want this development to be rapid, but at the same time it should be thorough and not superficial. I am alarmed at our languages becoming more and more like journalese. Rapid translations are made which are usually literal but they lose the essence of thought, apart from the grace of language.

I am convinced that real mass progress in India can only be made through our own languages and not through a foreign language. I am anxious to prevent a new caste system being perpetuated in India—an English-knowing caste separated from the mass of our people. That will be most unfortunate. This in fact happened during the British period. It could happen then because education was very limited. It cannot happen now, when education is becoming widespread.

I cannot conceive of English being the principal medium of education in India in the future. That medium has to be

Hindi or some other regional language. Only then can we remain in touch with our masses and help in a uniform growth.

But there are other aspects. One, I have mentioned above, about the necessity of knowing English or any other foreign language for scientific and technological purposes. Also, if I may say so with all respect, we are a narrow-minded people and are apt to live in our own shells. There is the danger of our getting cut off from the world of thought in all its aspects and becoming complacent in our own little world of India. For this reason also contacts with foreign languages are essential.

Thus I think that Hindi must be given every encouragement to grow and to be used for educational and administrative purposes, provided always that it grows on sound lines and not on superficial, journalistic lines. Secondly, Hindi (or some other regional language) has to be the medium of education.

Thirdly, English should be a compulsory second or third language. It is of course not necessary or possible for everybody in India to know English. But a very large number should know it for the reasons I have stated above. They can know it in two ways. One is a fully adequate knowledge of the language. The other is to know it as a language of comprehension, that is, to be able to read books and periodicals in it without perhaps being able to speak it easily. On the whole I am inclined to think that English as a compulsory subject in our schools (the medium being Hindi) is desirable. The schools will give some basic knowledge, enough perhaps for comprehension. After that, a relatively small number will proceed to a more thorough knowledge of English. It is obvious that English cannot be taken at the university stage. Universities are meant for specialized subjects, not for elementary teaching.

So far as teaching of science and technology is concerned, I think that even there the medium should be Hindi in our schools. At a later stage English would be necessary for some years to come. Even when English is not necessary for advanced teaching of science, it will nevertheless remain necessary for that wider contact with scientific literature.

As I have said above, I am all in favour of scientific and technical subjects being taught through the medium of Hindi or our other regional languages in the schools. But I do hope that the scientific and technical terms that we use will be common in the various Indian languages and, wherever possible, should be similar to words of international usage. Otherwise there will be confusion and the burden on the minds of the students will be great.

In many countries today, the teaching of a foreign language is compulsory in the schools. Usually English is the foreign language.

BUDDHA'S TEACHING TODAY

As YOU KNOW I function in the political field. I am a politician. Just now His Holiness said that a union of the spiritual field and the other fields of life was difficult. Indeed it is difficult and yet I have often wondered if there is any real hope for the world unless there is some kind of combination of the two. We have seen tremendous advances in knowledge—in knowledge of the physical world, in science and the achievements of science—and all our lives have been moulded by these achievements of science. We have also seen that while great and wonderful progress has been made which has brought much good to humanity, there is something essentially lacking about it. That is why all this progress has sometimes led to disaster. What is it that is lacking? Perhaps it is some kind of a spiritual element that is lacking, something that holds and restrains the great powers that have been let loose in the world by man's discoveries in science. We come back to this problem not only from the point of view of the individual, although that is important, but from another point of view, the point of view of the larger group or of the world itself.

Valedictory address at the Seminar on Buddhism's contribution to Art, Letters and Philosophy, New Delhi, November 29, 1956

How are we to restrain this tremendous force which often works for evil? I do not know how best to define the word 'civilization'. It is a curious word and one that is used in many ways and in many senses. But perhaps one aspect of culture and civilization is the growth of restraint in the individual and the community. Where will this restraint come from?

We find that restraint may perhaps come from fear, fear of consequences. Sometimes we are told that we shall be able to restrain the evil-doer by greater force. But we see that the evil-doer can argue in the same way and increase his own force. So it becomes a competition in trying to gain more and more force to impose one's will on others. We have seen that this attempt to restrain by stronger force, which in itself is an evil use of power, really leads to greater difficulties and to the further growth of the evil force. We have seen a race for armaments in a world of armies and armaments, we have seen how good people, peaceful people, become afraid and because they are afraid run the same race thinking that it might perhaps bring them some safety or security. We have also seen that it does not bring them safety or security. It only increases fear all round and fear is a bad companion for an individual or for a nation. It is bad for him and bad for those who come in contact with him, because fear, like some better qualities, is contagious also. In the world today we find the curious phenomenon that while the vast majority of mankind and possibly all of them desire peace, forces of evil, forces of violence, spread and grow, bringing in their train hatred and the desire to destroy and to crush others. This in its turn breeds in the other party fresh hatred and the desire to destroy. This process goes on, and there is a vicious circle.

How can we get out of this vicious circle? We have failed to get out of it during these many years and many generations. There must be some way other than the normal politician's way, other than the way which men of my kind and my profession, that is, the profession of politics, practise. Unless we tackle this problem in some such way there can be no solution of it and no assurance of peace.

We all talk rather glibly of peace and goodwill and co-operation, and yet at the same time we often act in a way

which belies our own professions. We live in fact two different lives—one, what people call the practical life or the life concerning practical affairs, the other, some other life which we reserve for our secluded moments. And so we develop double personalities both as individuals and as communities or nations. There is much that is good in all of us, but there is also much that is not good. The question is how to create an environment in which the good triumphs and the evil does not.

That is the problem which, I suppose, faces most sensitive persons in this world. Some cannot endure this continuing torment and retire from public activity and it may be that they gain some peace of mind and some wisdom. Others, even though tortured by the circumstances, feel that they cannot escape from this and that it is their duty and their function to continue and try to meet this problem in some better way.

I do not know what is ultimately the right way. Perhaps there are many ways and each individual has to seek his way to do good or to counter evil. But whatever ways there may be, surely the way of violence is not a good way. Surely the way of hatred is not a good way, not only because in principle and in theory it is not good, but also because the evidence of our eyes, the evidence of history, the evidence of recent events, has shown that the way of violence is not even a practical way, apart from theory and apart from idealism. It is this aspect of it which perhaps is troubling those who take pride in being practical. The man who calls himself a practical person apparently thinks only of the moment and does not think of the future consequences of his so-called practical act. I think that the so-called practical person is the most impractical of all, because he does not see to the right or to the left, and does not see at all into the future. The result is that he gets more and more entangled in his own tortuous thought and reasoning. That has been the consequence of the activities of this world even in the course of our generation, and we have seen it and have suffered from it.

We have now come to a stage when it has become of vital importance that some other element should be found,

something that is normally beyond the ken of the practical politician.

There are some earnest people, with some kind of a crusading spirit in them, who put forward brave ideals but somehow their voice is just a cry in the wilderness and does not seem to affect the world's activities in the slightest. A group of earnest people meet and discuss and talk about a brave new world, a brave world order, one world, all nations knit together, co-operation and friendliness. This is a fine idea, and ultimately perhaps an inevitable idea. And yet the people who talk in this way seem to produce no effect on any problem or any large number of human beings because they cut themselves off from the real problems of the day. We cannot merely think in the air and lay down utopias. We have to have our feet on the ground. But this in itself is not enough. If it is essential to have our feet on the ground it appears to be equally essential that our heads should be higher than the ground, even if they cannot reach the sky.

This problem is not a new problem; it is as old, I suppose, as history; but there is a certain newness about it today because the forces of violence have become so tremendous that unless they are held in check they might end up in irretrievable disaster for the world. While good has grown—at least the capacity to be good has grown—the capacity to do evil also has grown and the one will ultimately conquer the other. It is in this sense that I venture to say that there is a certain newness in this problem. Formerly if evil triumphed it triumphed in a small corner of the world. Today if it triumphs it might engulf the whole world.

This symposium that we have had, although it has dealt with rather scholarly subjects, with culture and art and philosophy, has not, so far as I know, dealt with this vital problem which a politician has to face. Nevertheless, I believe that it has had, and will have, a considerable influence on people's thinking—not this symposium alone, perhaps, but rather this great event, this significant event which we celebrate this year, the 2,500th anniversary of the Mahā-parinirvāṇa of the Buddha. It has directed people's attention more and more to the Buddha's essential message. In my own

country, as you all know, we have been strangely situated in regard to this matter. People say, and there is a measure of truth in it, that Buddhism as a religion gradually faded out from India. But whatever our thousand and one failings might be, there can be no doubt that the message of the Buddha and the personality of the Buddha impressed itself so powerfully on the Indian people and entered so deep into the texture of their thinking and their lives, that nothing could take it away and nothing did take it away. Although India did not follow the path of the Buddha in ceremonials, her whole thinking, even the practices of her other religions, were greatly influenced. In fact, such religion as India followed in all its varieties was an amalgam of the essential features of what the Buddha taught and some other systems.

I do not mean to say that we in India have been or are any more spiritual or better in any way than other people. Thinking themselves better than others is a weakness in which many people indulge in every country. Often a country which has not made good on the physical plane takes refuge in saying that it is better in some other sphere. I do not wish to encourage such thoughts. We are not better than anybody else. We are different. In some ways we may be better, but in some ways we are worse. This is true of all nations.

I think, and I say so without any desire to exaggerate, that the essence of the Buddha's teaching, which is, after all, the essence of all Indian thought before and after the Buddha—he himself was a product of this essential Indian background and Indian thought although he attained towering stature—has been woven into the texture of Indian life and thought. It is true that the greatest truths get covered up and all kinds of cobwebs of the imagination make it difficult for people to see them. That has happened in India and we have roamed about in metaphysical regions trying to understand the obvious in very roundabout ways and missing it. In spite of the fact that the teaching of the Buddha was woven into the texture of our thought, it was covered up in many ways. Therefore I welcome, in this great year of celebration, this renewed interest and desire to find out, to know and understand and to be influenced, more and more, by the

great message of the Buddha. In India, this year has shown a remarkable awakening in this respect. Our mind was prepared for it in many ways, not only by many past happenings but by our great leader, Mahatma Gandhi, who conditioned us in the course of this and the last generation, and whose voice and message sounded so often to us as a reiteration of the Buddha's.

I believe that it is essentially through the message of the Buddha that we can look at our problems in the right perspective, and draw back from conflict, and from competing with one another in the realm of conflict, violence and hatred. Every action has certain consequences. A good action has certain good consequences. An evil action has evil consequences. That I believe is as good a law of nature as any physical or chemical law. If that is so, hatred, which is evil, must have evil consequences. It can never bring good results. Violence, which is evil, must have evil consequences and, indeed, leads to the growth of violence. How then are we to escape from this vicious circle? I hope and believe that this year of the celebration of the 2,500th anniversary of the Parinirvana of the Buddha had led people to look deeper into these problems, and made them realize that they have to search for some kind of union between their day-to-day political, scientific, technological and other activities and a certain measure of spirituality.

As I told you when I inaugurated this symposium, I am no scholar, certainly not a scholar of religion and philosophy. But I have had to deal with many problems, national and international, and it is because of that and not because of any individual search that I have been driven to this conclusion.

I am very grateful to all of you reverend gentlemen and friends who have come here from far countries. I have no doubt that your deliberations will help many. But quite apart from what you have said and what you have written, the mere fact that all of us are meeting here in this way, getting to know one another, and getting further insights into this great message of the Buddha and the effect it has had on the world, is a great and significant thing in itself. Tortured as we are by crisis after crisis, we should be made to think in this great

year on another plane and realize that that is the only way to meet such crises.

I hope that the message of this symposium, the message that all of you have given in various ways, will spread and enter into the minds and hearts of many people and influence them in following the right path.

SCIENCE AND HUMILITY

I AM COMING HERE today from Hirakud where I performed or helped in the opening ceremony of a very magnificent piece of work of Indian engineers, the great Hirakud Dam. This, I am told, is the longest in the world. A day before that I performed or participated in a completely different function at Nalanda, a great university centre of 1,500 years ago in Magadha, which is now Bihar. At this place, where the ruins of the university still exist, my mind went back to the days of the Buddha. I thought of his message which, apart from its religious significance, was a message of tolerance, a message against superstition, rituals and dogma. It was a message essentially in the scientific spirit. The Buddha asked no man to believe anything except what could be proved by experiment and trial. All he wanted men to do was to seek the truth and not accept anything on the word of another, even though it be of the Buddha himself. That seems to me the essence of his message, besides tolerance and compassion; and it struck me that the message, far from being out of date today, had a peculiar significance in this world of ours.

The spirit of dogma, I say with respect, has affected badly the religious quest and made both minds and practices conform too rigidly. Rigid and intolerant ideas, ideas which assert in effect that "I am in possession of the truth, the whole truth, every bit of the truth, and nobody outside the pale has it," narrow men's minds, shutting the door against a tolerant and

objective approach, where men not only look up at the heavens without fear but are also prepared to look down into the pit of hell without fear. It seems to me that people in the Buddha's time were more advanced in tolerance and compassion than we are, although they were not so advanced in technology and science. While I was at Nalanda it struck me that quite apart from the religious issues, there might be something worthwhile in the pagan view of life, because it is a tolerant view of life. While it may hold one opinion it respects the opinion of the others, and allows that there may be truth in the others' opinions, too. It looks at the universe and the mysteries of the universe and tries to fathom them in a spirit of humility. It realizes that truth is too big to be grasped at once, that however much one may know there is always much else to be known, and that it is possible that others may possess a part of that truth; and so, while the pagan view of life worships its own gods, it also does honour to unknown gods.

The scientist is supposed to be an objective seeker after truth. Science has grown because in a large measure the great scientists have sought truth in that way. But I suppose no man today, not even a scientist, can live in a world of his own, in some kind of ivory tower, cut off from what is happening. Therefore, science today has perhaps begun to cross the borders of morals and ethics. If it gets divorced completely from the realm of morality and ethics then the power it possesses may be used for evil purposes. But above all, if it ties itself to the gospel of hatred and violence, then undoubtedly it will have taken a wrong direction which will bring much peril to the world. I plead with the scientists here and elsewhere to remember that the scientific spirit is essentially one of tolerance, one of humility, one of realization that somebody else may also have a bit of the truth. Scientists should note that they do not have a monopoly of the truth; that nobody has a monopoly, no country; no people, no book. Truth is too vast to be contained in the minds of human beings, or in books, however sacred.

I remember a deputation that went to Cromwell, the English Dictator, and insisted that he should follow a certain

line. Cromwell replied—and his reply is rather well known—“I beseech you gentlemen in the bowels of Christ to consider whether it is possible that you may be in the wrong.”

Let us be a little humble; let us think that the truth may not perhaps be entirely with us. Let us co-operate with others; let us, even when we do not appreciate what others say, respect their views and their ways of life.

Let us go back to an ancient age in India, Asoka's period 2,300 years ago. This man who was infinitely more than an emperor has left memorials all over this great land—memorials which you can see today. Among the messages that he gave, there is one which I think we should all remember not only in this country but elsewhere. Addressing his own people he said, “If you reverence your faith, while you reverence your own faith you shall reverence the faith of others. In reverencing the faith of others, you will exalt your own faith and will get your own faith honoured by others.” If you apply that message of tolerance not only to religion but to the other activities of human life such as politics, economics and science, you will find that it puts things in a different context. It is a context which is not very much in evidence today in the world where differences of opinion are not liked, where the tendency is to suppress the view, the opinion, or the way of life that is not approved of, where ultimately science itself becomes vitiated by a narrow outlook. This would have been bad enough at any time, but when we have the new weapons forged by the work of scientists hovering above us, then it becomes far more important and vital how people think today, how they react to other people's thinking, whether their minds are full of hatred and violence and intolerance, or whether they are growing in tolerance and in the appreciation of others.

A FAITH THROUGH LIFE

IT IS A GREAT HAPPINESS to me to be present here on this occasion and to imbibe again something of the spirit of this institution and of the memories that cling to this soil and these buildings and the gardens that we have around us. My only regret, if any, is that we are holding this convocation in this manner and not in the mango grove where we used to hold it. I suppose this is the inevitable price we have to pay for progress. I do wish that we could go back to the mango grove lest this one innovation should lead to others which will take us farther and farther away from the mango grove and all that it stands for. I have previously listened to the proceedings of your convocations, but whenever I listen to them, the repetition of the old Vedic hymns, of the aims and ideals of Visva-Bharati and of some of your songs, has a significance for me which does not become stale. There is a freshness about them because there is an essential truth and vitality in them. I feel that if those who teach and those who study in this institution will only remember and act up to these precepts, even to a small extent, it will do credit to this institution. And if by any chance the rest of India can do that, it will be a good thing indeed. For in this time of trouble and problems in the world, when people feel terribly frustrated and are in doubt about what to do and what not to do, and when it is not often easy to come to a decision, it becomes essential to hold on to something by which we can measure problems and questions, some anchor not only for our personal life but for our national life. I think that the ideals which Gurudev laid down and which you have enshrined in your Visva-Bharati's aims and objectives, give us that anchor. If we adhere to them, we shall never go wrong really though we may make many a mistake. Small mistakes do not matter; it is the basic mistakes that matter. One can recover from the small mistakes but it is much more difficult to recover from any basic error in our approach. This is how I feel whenever I come here. I do not know whether I am

Address at the Visva-Bharati Samavartana, Santiniketan,
January 15, 1957

helpful to you in any way or not, but I can tell you in all honesty that you and this institution and the memory of Gurudev are of enormous help to me in the problems that I have to face from day to day. And often when doubts and difficulties arise, that memory inspires me, and if it does not solve the problem, at any rate it puts me in a better frame of mind to tackle it.

The more I think of the wisdom of Gurudev the more astonished I am, even though I ought not to be. Long ago when many things that he said had not become current coin in this country, his analysis of the disease, if I may call it a disease, that was enervating India, and his way of seeking to cure it, stood out as remarkable prophecies of the shape of things to come. Three months before his death he wrote his famous essay 'Crisis in Civilization' from which a brief extract has been quoted by Professor Mahalanobis. I remember reading it when I was in some prison or the other, and I remember how powerfully I was affected. And I then wondered—as I do again listening to it now—how very intimately and precisely what Gurudev wrote in that essay is applicable today, perhaps even more so than when he wrote it. Because he was a seer he could see ahead things yet unborn. Here we are facing this crisis of civilization and people talk and act more and more in terms of might and the insolence of power; and others, afraid of power, line up behind that power. And the good things of life suffer, the very basis of a decent approach to life—call it religious, call it spiritual, call it scientific. They are submerged in this deluge of hatred and violence and fear. Fear and hatred and violence are the worst companions that an individual or a nation can have. And yet today these probably are the dominating urges in many countries and many people. I do not know what an individual or even a nation can do to fight this menace or to face it. In the final analysis one has to rely on some kind of a basic faith in the future of man, to which again Gurudev made such frequent reference. Without that basic faith in something in man, it would be difficult enough to see or save a world which is drifting apparently towards an almost irretrievable disaster. And yet that basic faith gives one the

strength to survive. Looking back on the long perspective and panorama of history, one sees periods when great crises faced the world, and people living then thought that their time was the worst of all times, the most critical, the most dangerous. And yet the world survived, and not only survived but went ahead and made good in some other directions. Likewise, perhaps, we who live in these times may be attaching too great an importance to certain evil and unhappy aspects of these times, not realizing that under this crust, good things may be happening which will break out and take humanity further. It is good to have that faith and it is good to have some anchorage which will prevent us from drifting too much. Here in Visva-Bharati we have something which is not easy to reproduce elsewhere. We can build up a great university, great in the sense of big buildings and equipment and all that, but it is very difficult to build up traditions, to build up an atmosphere which surrounds a place, and to build up memories which are so powerful in guiding and in affecting our minds and hearts. You have that inestimable advantage here, which you cannot have merely by the reading of books, though books should no doubt be read. And I hope you will take full advantage of this inestimable heritage, because I feel that in many ways that is needed in India more than almost anything else.

We have in India a large number of universities which are producing good people. But we sometimes complain of their behaviour, though I am not worried about it. What I am rather worried about is whether these people have the depth that they should have, because that is more important than the passing of examinations. Creativeness, productiveness, a certain sincerity of purpose, a certain depth, are the very things on which here at Santiniketan and in Visva-Bharati, Gurudev laid stress all the time. He emphasized those things to which enough attention is not paid in other institutions of learning. He wanted to provide the widest possible cultural background so that the narrowness of spirit and mind would be removed. It is not easy to do so, even if a great teacher tells us. But it helps if we are constantly reminded of that wider vision. This institution was meant to

be a kind of symbol of that spirit—the international, universal spirit.

You started under good auspices. You have had difficulties here, but these should not trouble you very much. It is always a very difficult thing to follow a great founder, a great teacher, a great man. If you had the privilege of having as your founder one of the greatest sons that India has ever produced, well, you have to suffer for it. You cannot have these great men age after age. You can have them only in your memory and in the vivid and vital traditions that they leave in their words and in their works. Apart from the crises in the world, here in India we face many difficult problems. You too, no doubt, will be thinking about them. Don't be worried. Don't be frustrated by the immensity of the problems. The problems are immense, no doubt, but so is our will and our determination and so is the will of the innumerable people in India who will work for the solution of those problems. It is not you and I alone that will do it. One has to put one's individual life in some relation to the national life that is developing, and the national life in some relation to the international life. Thus you spread yourselves out and though your feet may be and should be certainly on the firm ground, your head should occasionally touch the clouds.

I wish you well and I wish this institution well. But it is not my wishing you well that will matter much, but to what extent you remember the message of Gurudev and the ideals enshrined in this Visva-Bharati.

Our Upacharya* referred to the necessity of developing science in this institution. If you want to develop science more, you could not have done better than have as your Upacharya one of the most eminent men of science not only in India but in the world. I certainly agree with him that it would be the right thing for Visva-Bharati to stress science more, so that the kind of training that is given here is more balanced and more suitable for what is happening in India, and for the calls the country might make upon you

* Professor S. N. Bose, Vice-Chancellor of Visva-Bharati

and everyone of us. We are being called constantly to greater endeavour in many fields of activity, not one only. We have to train ourselves for them because only those people who are trained in mind and body can really do effective work. Mere goodwill is not enough. It is good to have goodwill, it is good to have enthusiasm, but it is essential to have training. No handicraft or other work can be done merely by enthusiasm. You have to learn the art, and we want to train men today and to develop institutions which give the basis of that training. We want trained men in technical fields. In the world today technology has made such great progress that people tend to forget other things, and culture in the real sense decays. A kind of technological culture of course progresses, which is good in so far as it goes, provided it is balanced by other forms of culture. It will not profit a man very much if he is clever with his hands, or even with his tongue or brain, but has no foundations of character or wider vision. Such a society will ultimately perish. So this drift to technology which is inevitable today in the world and in India has to be balanced by the other aspects of culture, which, fortunately, Visva-Bharati has laid stress on. It is necessary that the development in scientific teaching should also take place, otherwise you may find some difficulty later in even understanding what is happening in India or in participating in the developments in the full way that you really ought to.

I should like to express again my great happiness at being here today. I wish all of you in this great institution prosperity in the future.

MISCELLANEOUS

CHANGING HINDU SOCIETY

I. SPECIAL MARRIAGE BILL

THIS BILL does not form part of what is called the Hindu Code series of Bills. Nevertheless, it is connected with the various changes that are sought to be brought about, so that it may be considered, broadly speaking, a part of that approach.

During the last many years, we—this House and its predecessors—have been considering this matter in various forms. At least on two or three occasions I gave an assurance to this House that we shall expedite this matter. But somehow or other my assurance did not produce much effect on the situation; and, in spite of our wishes, there has been delay. It is true that in a matter of this kind one cannot rush on and one has to give every consideration to various viewpoints in this House as well as outside. Nevertheless, it is rather unfortunate that there has been such considerable delay. Therefore, it is a matter of peculiar satisfaction to me that we are at last coming to grips with these problems in the shape of this Bill and one or two others that will follow.

I am not scholar enough to discuss the niceties of Hindu law. But I have dabbled in some broad studies of law and custom and history and cultural developments. My own conception of Hindu society has been that it is essentially dynamic, not static and unchangeable. Indeed the mere fact that it has lasted a long time is due to a certain dynamism which has enabled it to adapt itself to changing conditions. Gradually, Hindu society became rather static, through the hardening of the caste system and in various other ways. This process was spread over hundreds of years, and the final

Speech in Lok Sabha during the debate on the Special Marriage Bill, May 22, 1954

seal was set upon it with the advent of British Government in this country. Whenever we talked of Hindu law, we always talked of Hindu law and custom which meant that custom was gradually changing Hindu law. That is, as conditions changed, customs developed which affected the law in practice, whatever it might have been in the ancient texts. Of course, there are so many ancient texts that one can quote the scripture for any argument. Anyhow, the coming of the British, as I said, made the whole conception static, because they codified our law, and did so with the help of the most conservative sections of the community they could find. And they codified it in a way which might have been suitable a thousand years earlier. Because it has been codified it cannot be changed except by legislation, which we are now trying to do. The British were not interested in our law this way or that way; they were only anxious to have some kind of peace in such matters so that they could carry on their exploitation or whatever you may like to call it. So, the coming of the British suppressed the dynamic element in Hindu society. In fact, it made it unchangeable except by legislation, and in the early days, of course, there was no reform legislation.

We have gone through political revolution in this country, and become independent. We are going through a process of economic change. There is another aspect, which is equally important, and that is social change. I do not think it is possible for you to think in terms of political change ignoring economic and social change. Most people now admit that economic change is as necessary as political change, but some people seem to think that 'social' change, using the word in a narrower context, is something entirely different from political and economic matters and that social life can be kept a closed preserve. I submit that this is not the right outlook, because life is an integrated whole. If the political context changes or the economic outlook varies, it follows that the social context also changes, whether you wish it or not. Therefore, a true revolution in a country must take into account all the three aspects together. The person who considers himself a political revolutionary but a reactionary

or a conservative in the economic sense or in the social sense is not an integrated person; he lives in compartments, like Jekyll and Hyde.

Take the problem of untouchability. I cannot quote the sacred books, but many people hold that the sacred books enjoined it on them. Nevertheless, we came to the conclusion long ago that it must be done away with not only because it was unjust but, as Gandhiji repeatedly said, for the very survival of Hindu society. That is to say, this important social change became essential even from the narrower point of view of Hindu society itself. That manner of thinking has to be applied to other problems of human relationships as well. After all, the biggest problems of the world are human relationships—whether of one individual with another, or an individual with a group, or one group with another group.

So far as this particular Bill is concerned, as the House knows, it is a permissive measure; it is not forced down anybody's throat. It is essential to have permissive measures as a half-way house which will lead to other measures. I do not propose to say anything about the clauses of the Bill. I think that as the Bill has emerged from the Council of States (Rajya Sabha), it would be desirable to make alterations or amendments only here and there, not in regard to any big principles. This is not, we all know, any kind of a party measure. It is a measure affecting all of us. The Bill concerns not merely Hindus, for it is a permissive measure which anybody can take advantage of. I welcome this Bill.

II. THE DIVORCE CLAUSE

MANY PEOPLE SEEM to imagine that by bringing in divorce you break up the system of marriage. I am absolutely convinced that by bringing in divorce you make for happier marriages, normally. I am not speaking of individual cases.

We are often told that divorce is something against the basic conventions and ideas of Hindu society. It seems to me that almost anything can be described that way because Hindu society is so wide, so broad-based and so various that you can say anything about it either historically or as it actually exists today. While we talk about Hindu society, are we talking about a few high-caste people or are we talking and thinking in terms of the 250 or 300 million Hindus in this country? When we want to impress other people with numbers, we shout we are 270 million Hindus. But when we come to brass tacks, as when we talk about reforms, we think of a certain small group at the top. We cannot have it both ways.

Apart from that, what is Hindu society? In order to get the right conception, I say with all deference that you should not read some rigid enactments, like the Commandments of Manu. You should rather look into the social life as evolved in our country in the past ages. A better way, probably, is to have some glimpses of the social life as found in our older books. Take one of our old plays, the *Mrichchakatika*. Read it if you have not read it. See the tender humanity that is found in the play. There is in it no rigid puritanism but a human approach to the difficult problems of life. *Mrichchakatika* was probably written in the fifth century A.D., that is, about 1,400 years ago or more. I need not describe the play. The point is that the man who wrote it reflected the life of his day. If you read it, you see a society which is highly cultured. The individual is highly developed. The test of an individual is how he treats his wife, his son or his neighbour. How he behaves towards another, how he functions in a social relationship—that is the test of the individual. If this test is applied,

Speech in Lok Sabha on the Divorce Clause of the Special Marriage Bill, September 16, 1954

our people in those days appear to have been amazingly advanced and tolerant and generous in outlook.

I was talking about tests. There is another test. In primitive societies we had totems and taboos. I wish to say nothing against totems or taboos. But normally they are instances of primitiveness. The more a society grows, the fewer the totems and taboos; because totems and taboos are replaced by self-restraint. That is again a test of a society's growth : self-restraint, not the application of the policeman's rod. In international affairs we try to avoid war as a solution of problems. In the national sphere, we try to settle problems peacefully. In the same way, in the domestic sphere, in the husband-and-wife sphere, cultured society avoids the rod of the policeman, that is, of the law coming down and punishing. It is a sign of the culture of a society or a nation to do away with the use of violence. If that is so in other spheres, much more so is it in this intimate, domestic sphere of the family. Whether it is husband and wife or father and child, the rod is not a good way of dealing with the situation. I use the word rod here for any law which oppresses, which constrains, which restricts, which punishes.

Our laws, our customs—for the moment I am speaking of the upper strata—fall heavily on the womenfolk. That is why we are introducing this and other pieces of legislation. This is a voluntary, permissive piece of legislation which people may or may not accept. If they marry in this way, they accept certain consequences. I do not see how anybody can object to it. Even though one objects, one has no reason to restrain other people, who do not object, from having their way. I am afraid many of our people have not got over primitive totems and taboos. We still live a clan life and think in a clan way, and many of our troubles are due to that fact. Therefore, I beg the House to take a larger view.

Divorce must not be looked upon as something which makes the custom of marriage fragile. I do not accept that. If that is so, I say that marriage itself has become a cloak. It is not a real marriage of the minds or bodies. If you compel and force people in this way, it will just be an enforced thing which has no value left in ethics and morality. Certainly stop them

from acting rashly. Give them time. Make attempts to bring about a reconciliation. If all that fails, don't permit a state of affairs which, I think, is the essence of evil, which is bad for them, which is bad for the children, bad for everybody. I would particularly beg the House to take the view that this clause about divorce by mutual consent, subject to time, subject to reconciliation, subject to all such approaches, so that nothing may be done in a hurry, is a right and proper clause. It will produce a happier adjustment and a better relationship between the parties than would be produced if one party thinks that he can misbehave as much as he likes and nothing will happen.

The House knows that customs have grown up under which different standards of morality are applied to men and women. You will find women standing up for this right of divorce though some men may challenge it because men happen to be in a dominant position. I hope they will not continue in that dominant position for all time. These different standards of morality cannot be maintained. Therefore, the approach in this Bill is to bring about a certain measure of equality between them. It is true that this cannot be done by law only. It is a question of custom, education, and basically of the economic position of the individual.

Some people say that if we have divorce by mutual consent, the husband will exploit the wife, will kick her out and force her to give consent. It is a possibility; it may happen as many worse things often happen. I do not think it will happen if you give time. If the husband does want to behave in that way, the sooner the wife is rid of him the better.

III. THE HINDU MARRIAGE BILL

IT IS A MATTER of great gratification to me that we have arrived at the Third Reading stage of this Bill and I have every hope that this House will finalize it in the course of the next few hours. I approve of this Bill. It represents not merely what is incorporated in it but something more. I think it is highly important in the context of our national development. We talk about our Five-Year Plans, about economic progress, industrialization, political freedom and all that. They are all highly important. But I have no doubt in my mind that the real progress of the country means progress not only on the political plane, not only on the economic plane, but also on the social plane. They have to be integrated, all these, when a great nation goes forward.

I welcome this particular measure because I think it is of the highest importance that we should take up the social challenge. On a previous occasion, speaking, I think, not on this Bill but on a similar measure, the Special Marriage Bill, I ventured to say something about my reading. I speak, of course, before experts with some trepidation, but I venture to say what my conception of Hindu law is.

Hindu law had never been rigid; it had a certain dynamic element in it : indeed that was its strength. It was not a law of the statute book which could be changed at will. It encouraged many kinds of customs to grow up. When they grew up it acknowledged them. In fact, even today in India there are so many varieties of Hindu law—in the south, in the north, in the east—that it is very difficult to say that this is the one and the only Hindu law. There is variety all over. Then again, everyone knows that a great majority of Hindus, apart from the few topmost castes, are governed by all kinds of customs. Would anyone here venture to say that they are not Hindus and drive them out of the Hindu fold? Surely not. Therefore, the essential quality of Hindu law in the old times was this dynamic quality. It did not change by decree or statute, but by allowing changes to creep in.

Speech during debate on the Third Reading of the Hindu Marriage Bill in Lok Sabha, May 5, 1955

Now I venture to ask : can any law, whether it is social or economic, be applicable with equal force when society has changed completely? Let us take the India of a thousand or two thousand years ago. The population of India in those days was one-hundredth of what it is today and India was a community of a large number of villages and some small towns. Modern conditions are entirely different. In the cities of Delhi, Calcutta, Bombay and Madras industries are growing and new social relationships are being established. Can anyone say that while all these changes are taking place in our social set-up, certain things must remain unchanged?

This Bill has been discussed here for a few days, but behind it lie years and years of investigation. First there was Sir B. N. Rau's Committee which functioned for a number of years. Here in this Parliament this matter has come up for the last three and a half years. Even before this Parliament came into being Bills had repeatedly been moved. No subject, I take it, has been so much before the public, and discussed so much, as this particular subject of the reform of the Hindu law in regard to personal relationships. It was right that there should have been so much opportunity given for public consideration, because it is an important measure.

This morning a fact came to my notice, that in the small State of Saurashtra, one of our smallest States—one of our socially advanced States, if I may say so—there is on an average one suicide a day among the women because of maladjustments in human relationships. The figure was 375 in a year : 375 in a population of 40 lakhs. You can calculate the proportion it works out to in that State. These are authentic figures which the Chief Minister of that State gave me. This shows the maladjustment and the difficulties that the women have to face. I have no doubt that similar statistics may be collected from other parts of India.

I had the privilege of listening to the speech of the hon. Member opposite, Shri N. C. Chatterjee. The more I listened to it, the more confused and surprised I got. He dealt at great length with what a sacrament is and what a *samskara* is. Let it be a sacrament. What does it mean? A sacrament, I take it, is some ceremony which has a religious significance.

A Hindu marriage is a religious ceremony, undoubtedly. But does it mean that it is a sacrament to tie up people who bite, who hate each other, who make life hell for each other? Is that a sacrament or a *samskara*? I do not understand. I would go a step further. I think all human relationships should have an element of the sacrament in them. More so the intimate relationship of husband and wife. There is something fine in human relationships provided they are good relationships. Otherwise, the relationship is the reverse of fine. If people have no compatibility, if they are compelled to carry on together, they begin to hate each other and their life becomes bitter. The whole foundations of their existence become bitter. Surely that is not sacrament.

Shri Chatterjee referred to Manu and Yajnavalkya, very great men in our history, who have shaped India's destiny. We admire them. They are among the heroes of our history. But is it right for Shri Chatterjee or anyone else to throw Manu and Yajnavalkya at me and say what they would have done in the present conditions of India?


SHRI N. C. CHATTERJEE : I am sorry, the Prime Minister was not here. Shri Pataskar threw them on me and I only returned them.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU : The point is, it is very unfair for Manu or Yajnavalkya or anybody else to be brought in as a witness as to what should be done in the present conditions of India. The conditions are completely and absolutely different. I admit that there should be, and there are, undoubtedly, certain principles of human life which do not change and should not change. But, in making legislation, you have to consider the conditions as they are and not as they were 1,000 or 2,000 years ago.

Then again—I speak subject to correction by Shri Chatterjee—he referred to some learned professor of some university who has produced a pamphlet. I happened to see the pamphlet because he had drawn my attention to it. I was surprised that any person, learned or unlearned, should have produced it. What is this pamphlet? It is based chiefly on a certain report in America known as the Kinsey report. It is designed to show what the conditions in the United States of



With folk dancers at the Republic Day celebrations, January 1957



Plying the charkha at the special prayers offered at the Samadhi of Mahatma Gandhi at Rajghat (Delhi)



With Mr. Urho Kekkonen, President of Finland, at Helsinki, June 1957

With Prime Minister Einar Gerhardsen of Norway (left), and the Foreign Minister, Mr. H. Lange (centre), during visit to the Akershus Castle, Oslo, June 1957





*Taking the salute at a march past at the National Stadium
in New Delhi on Children's Day, November 1957*

*Announcing the publication of a new part of the critical edition of the
Mahabharata at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, August 1956*





Watching his pet panda on the lawns of his home in New Delhi

America are. First of all, for a professor, learned or unlearned, to go about issuing pamphlets condemning other people and the customs of other countries is not a good thing. It is not good for him to do so, or for anyone of us. If it is a scientific study, well and good. But to make that a parallel and say, "See how horrible the conditions in America are; if you pass this Bill, you will have the same conditions here," is not only *non sequitur* in logic, but is a bad approach. Very few of us who are present here—I would venture to say, none of us—are competent to give any worthwhile opinion about the conditions in America or England or Russia or anywhere. We read about them in the newspapers; maybe we read books about them. We do not know the context; we do not know the historical development; we do not know the facts. The major thing that affects human relationships in the world today is the growth of industrialization. The fact that because of industrialization vast numbers of people live in huge industrial centres, leads to all kinds of neuroses. That can be studied in a scientific manner. To make that a parallel and say that if this Bill is passed all kinds of looseness, laxity and licentiousness will prevail is unworthy of a professor, learned or unlearned.

Apart from this, I should like in this context to say something about a habit that some of us have, to condemn other people, other countries, their customs, their religion, or their economic principles, and take pride in the fact that we are superior. It is a narrow approach and an uncivilized approach. The right approach is : watch them, learn from them, be warned by what you see there, avoid the things that you think are wrong, and accept the things that you think are right. Do not shout about things in other countries. Instead of condemning other people, rather think of your own failings.

In this context, with your permission, I should like to quote an ancient passage which, I hope, represents the real spirit of Indian culture, the real spirit of that old *sanskriti* that is talked about by people who sometimes do not themselves exhibit it. I am going to quote from the famous Rock Edict No. XII of Asoka, 2,300 years ago :

"The beloved of the gods does not value either gifts or reverential

offerings so much as an increase of the spiritual strength of the followers of all religions.

"This increase of spiritual strength is of many forms.

"But the one root is the guarding of one's speech so as to avoid the extolling of one's own religion and the decrying of the religion of another, or speaking lightly of it without occasion or relevance.

"As proper occasions arise, persons of other religions should also be honoured suitably. Acting in this manner, one certainly exalts one's own religion and also helps persons of other religions. Acting in a contrary manner, one injures one's own religion and also does disservice to the religions of others.

"One who reverences one's own religion and disparages that of another from devotion to one's own religion and to glorify it over all other religions, does injure one's own religion more certainly.

"It is verily concord of all religions that is meritorious, as persons of other ways of thinking may thereby hear the Dharma and serve its cause."

The word religion is used here. I take it that the word in the original was *dharma*, which has, of course, a wider significance. It applies not only to religions, but ways of life. I wish that this inscription of Asoka which has been carved out on some rocks could be multiplied and be made available to vast numbers of people, because I believe that it represents the essence of the old Indian approach which has given strength to Indian culture in the past, and which, to the extent it survives, gives us strength today. Now we see something entirely opposed to this: running down others, condemning others, extolling ourselves, claiming that our country is good, or that as groups of individuals we are good. Well, goodness shows itself, it does not require extolling by the persons concerned.

I am glad that in this Bill, custom, etc., has been excluded. It will be wrong to interfere with custom. If I may refer to this again, the fact is that 80 per cent, or whatever is the percentage, of the Hindus actually at the present moment enjoy divorce in some form or other. If that is so, do you want a few higher castes to remain the elect, cut off from the rest, looking down upon them, considering themselves the real descendants of Manu and Yajnavalkya and others as outside the pale? That is not the way of democracy, nor is it the way of building up a unified society in India.

We are often reminded of the high ideals of Indian womanhood, Sita and Savitri. Well, everyone here, I take it, admires these ideals and thinks of Sita and Savitri and other heroines of India with reverence and respect and affection. Sita and Savitri are mentioned as ideals for the women. I do not seem to remember men being reminded in the same manner of Ramachandra and Satyavan, and urged to behave like them. It is only the women who have to behave like Sita and Savitri; the men may behave as they like. I do not know whether Indian men are supposed to be perfect, incapable of any further improvement.

You cannot have a democracy if you cut off a large chunk of humanity, fifty per cent of the people, and put them in a class apart in regard to social privileges and the like. They are bound to rebel, and rightly. I believe some hon. Members spoke with disdain of what they consider certain trends in the social life of upper-class Indian women. Well, I am not a great admirer of certain types of development which we see in New Delhi. If we do not like these developments, let us try to change them. But what exactly does that argument lead to? Does it mean that you should perpetuate or petrify conditions which themselves are leading to these cracks and break-ups in Hindu society?

Then again, it is said: "These reforms are all very well, We are in favour of them, but they do not amount to much unless you create different economic conditions for the women." That is an argument which may be logically valid, but, when applied to these things, it simply means: "Do not do this. You have not done the first; you are doing the second." Such critics, in effect, merely say that nothing need be done. That is absurd. You have to make a beginning somewhere. Of course, I entirely agree that the basic thing is equality of economic opportunity. To some extent, I hope, another Bill which is following soon, will take care of that.

The House will remember how it tried at first—not in this Parliament, but in the previous Parliament—to bring forward the Hindu Code Bill, a huge document of hundreds and hundreds of pages. We considered it in various ways, introduced it in the House, referred it to committees. It was so

big that we could never get it through. In fact, we never started properly with it, and it was patent that if we went through it, it might take a few years. Therefore, it was decided to split it up into several compartments and deal with each separately. This is the first part of it.

I referred to Indian women and said that I am no admirer of certain tendencies which are visible. They are not visible in Indian women only, they are visible elsewhere too. But I would beg of you again not to fall into the trap of appearing to criticize other countries and people about whom we know very little. Some of us may have gone abroad, spent two or three weeks or months abroad, and formed some opinions. Is that the way you would like a foreigner to form an opinion of Indian society? You would not. When he comes here for two months and writes a book, you object strongly because he has picked out some things which he dislikes and runs you down. Now, if I go to Banaras, there are many things that I do not like. The streets are not clean, and so on. But Banaras evokes in me a thousand pictures of India's history, of Buddha preaching in Sarnath, of its being the seat of India's culture, and such other things. I am filled with India's history when I go to Banaras. When some tourist comes from abroad, he sees only the filth and dirt of Banaras lanes. Both pictures are true. We who go abroad fall into the same trap. We see some filth—social and other—and think that that is the basis of society there. Do you think that the civilization of the West or your civilization or the civilization of any country has been built on these weak, immoral foundations? Obviously not. Countries of the West may have been colonial Powers. They may have done injury to us. But the fact is that they have built a great civilization in the last 200 or 400 years.

After all, we have got to build our house on our own soil, with our own ideas. But we must keep the windows of our mind open to the winds that come from other countries. The moment we close ourselves up, that moment we become static. It has been the greatness, I think, of the basic Hindu approach to life that it was not rigid. As everybody knows, we have at the same time a civilized trend and an orthodox trend completely opposed to each other. On the one hand,

for example, there is a spirit of tolerance; a man may be an atheist and still not cease to be a Hindu. But, on the other, there are certain social practices which say you must not eat with so and so or touch so and so. That rigidity is a thing which has weakened and brought many disasters to Hindu society. We have to break that rigidity. I am glad that we have broken the rigidity in regard to untouchability. I hope we shall break the rigidity due to caste divisions. It becomes equally important that we should break rigid statute law or interpretation of law by judges which has brought about rigidity in regard to human relations in Hindu society. It is because of that that I welcome this Bill. As anybody who has read this Bill can see, the conditions provided for divorce and so on are not easy. For anyone to say that this will let loose licentiousness all over India is fantastic.

So far as I am concerned, I do not propose to say anything about women in other countries. I am not competent to judge the social fabric of other countries. Though I may be a little more competent perhaps, because of the opportunities I have had for travel abroad, than many Members here, yet I say I am not competent to judge. But I can say with considerable confidence that I am proud of the women of India. I am proud of their beauty, grace, charm, shyness, modesty, intelligence and their spirit of sacrifice, and I think if anybody can truly represent the spirit of India, the women can do it and not the men. Every time that a woman has been sent abroad, she has done well; not only done well, but produced a fine impression about the womanhood of India.

I have the greatest admiration—I am not talking about the ancient ideal of Indian womanhood, which I certainly admire—for the women of India today. I have faith in them. I am not afraid to allow them freedom to grow, because I am convinced that no amount of legal constraint can prevent society from going in a certain direction. And if you put too much legal constraint, the structure breaks. I mentioned a simple case, of Saurashtra. There are many more given in B. N. Rau's Report, and if you go into this matter, you will find that the position of Indian women, more especially of the upper classes, is parlous today. It is bad legally,

economically and socially. I welcome this Bill because it is a good attempt to improve that condition and to shake off the rigidity in our structure.

TASKS FOR THE PRESS

OFTEN IN YOUR conferences and your resolutions you discuss what is called the freedom of the Press. You take exception to any restrictions being imposed on this freedom. You are justified, of course, in doing so because the freedom of the Press is not only included in the various freedoms in our Constitution, but, if I may say so, it is an actuality in our country. I have often wondered what exactly is meant by freedom of the Press or anybody else's. The more I have thought about it, the more I have become convinced that there is no such thing as abstract freedom. Freedom is always accompanied by responsibility. Freedom always entails an obligation, whether it is a nation's freedom or an individual's freedom or a group's freedom or the freedom of the Press. Therefore, whenever we consider the question of freedom, we must also inevitably consider the responsibility that goes with freedom. If there is no responsibility and no obligation attached to it, freedom gradually withers away. This is true of a nation's freedom and it applies as much to the Press as to any other group, organization or individual.

It is in this integrated way that I would like you and others to think of the freedom of the Press. After all, this question belongs to the broad field of tolerance of thought and expression which is part of a democratic set-up. There is a thought which has occurred to me—that even the freedom of the Press might sometimes curb this expression of thought, and that it might rather terrorize, limit and regiment the public to some extent. This question therefore cannot be

From an address to the All-India Newspaper Editors' Conference, New Delhi, August 13, 1954.

considered as an abstract formula, but is to be looked at in all its various aspects.

Our Constitution is an expression of the democratic urge which permeated our Constituent Assembly. The Constitution embodies Fundamental Rights and Directive Principles of Policy which assure many types of freedom. Our State is a secular State which gives equal opportunity to every group, every part of the country, every State, province and area. Nevertheless, you will agree with me that some parts of the Press at any rate, instead of stressing these aspects of our Constitution and of our outlook, stress a disruptive and separatist communal aspect. I would beg of you to consider whether in doing so they are actively helping this freedom of thought and expression. I want you to recognize and put before the public our great achievements in India. Sometimes you do it but sometimes you are too wrapped up in local problems.

It is not enough to talk of political unity. We must have something deeper than that. We must have emotional unity, which does away with provincial barriers, with caste barriers or communal or religious barriers. Only then can you talk about a really unified India. Only then can you achieve that broad tolerance of thought and expression which you lay stress on when you speak of the freedom of the Press. We shall need it more and more in our general relations between different groups and different parts.

We criticize and condemn communalism because it is the very opposite of the conception of broad tolerance and of India's emotional unity. Another phase of communalism is casteism. I do not think we have given sufficiently intensive thought to the removal of this scourge and curse of casteism. We have taken it for granted and sometimes I fear we have even encouraged caste for fear of losing the vote of one caste or another. So far as I am concerned I am prepared to lose every election in India but to give no quarter to communalism or casteism. Our fight will be relatively easy if our newspapers throw themselves into the fray on the right side. It will be helpful if they at least keep away from the wrong side, which some of them will not do. Perhaps they think that

a sensational way of presenting things appeals to the people and enhances their circulation. It may; I am no judge of it. But I claim to be a judge of the Indian people and I claim to be a better judge of them than any editor in India. I tell you I know them better because—it is rather a foolish way of saying it—I am intensely in love with them, because I have approached them with affection, because they have been most generous, extravagantly generous in their affection for me and I have the highest opinion of the Indian people. I think it is degrading to them to imagine that they require sensationalism of the type that appeals to the palate or excites passions. Of course, they are not angels. All of us have our faults. We have our evil side and our good side. But I am quite sure that there is a very great deal of the good side in the Indian people, and if we appeal to it we shall always get the right response. If our newspapers keep this in view and appeal to the good side, they will help in the emotional integration of India. They will thus do a great service. Let us think not only of our past common heritage, but of the India that we are building up which will also be a common heritage of all of us. I would submit to the editors that through this service to the people they will ultimately be serving themselves also.

I do not mean by this that I am in any way suggesting that you should stop criticizing Governmental measures or the activities of politicians. I do not wish to come in the way, legislatively or otherwise, of the widest criticism or even condemnation of Governmental policy. Of course you will give me freedom to reply, and reply not merely in the Chambers of Parliament but in the market place, in the field and amongst the common people. We should have criticism; it is essential, provided it is *bona fide* criticism, and not sensationalism or something that verges on vulgarity. I have often wondered whether freedom of expression implies all kinds of vulgar and obscene approaches. My idea of freedom does not include them. Degradation of the public taste is terrible. We have to oppose it.

Of the dominating features of the age we live in, one of the most noticeable is that people are gradually losing the art of thinking. They often take other people's opinions for

granted. They are regimented, not only in states that are called totalitarian but in other countries also, by the conditions they live in. They are not allowed to think, and the person who does not fit in with the majority opinion, has a very unfortunate time of it. There is no law against him, but the facts are against him. In this matter the newspapers can perform a very valuable service, although newspapers too inevitably have become more like pocket digests than something that will enable people to think. I do not know how far it is possible to get out of the difficulty but it is dangerous for people to think less and less, and to be flooded by pocket magazines or newspapers instead of really worthwhile books. Newspapers have their place but newspapers do not often help one to think. How many of you would remember what you had read in the newspapers a week ago? You will find that you have almost entirely forgotten it, because it has left no impress on you although it might have excited you for a day or two. Probably the man who wrote it has forgotten it too. All of us, of course, cannot be creative artists or original thinkers, but we should accept other people's thoughts only after thinking for ourselves, and not blindly.

I would like you to think of this major adventure of India that is taking place today. Criticize it whenever there is any failure, whenever there is any falling off, whenever there is weakness. Criticism will be an incentive to better work. But try to understand and appreciate that something magnificent and colossal is happening in India.

A large number of our people go to foreign countries to see what is happening there. We have much to learn, but sometimes it surprises me that people are not equally interested in making a tour of India and seeing what is happening in India. They travel ten thousand miles to see what is happening elsewhere, rather than a thousand or two thousand miles in India to see what is happening here. I would suggest for your earnest consideration that you might think of what is happening in India today and, what is more, make other people in India think of what is happening outside their own narrow sphere. That way they will have a sensation not only of our achievement and fulfilment but

of a certain common purpose. What is happening down south in Madras should be as exciting to me in the Punjab as Bhakra-Nangal should be to persons in Madras. It is a common heritage that we are building up.

APPROACH TO THE TRIBES

I HEARD of this conference only three days ago when Mrs. Khongmen told me about it. It struck me immediately that it would be a happy idea to have such a conference and I was surprised that it had been delayed so long, although I confess I do not particularly like to give trouble to various State Ministers to rush forward and backward between Delhi and their States. We, here in Delhi, have quite a number of Ministries, and conferences are arranged at the least provocation. They are so many that I think some check is necessary. This conference, however, is a good idea.

When we talk about tribal people, I wonder whether we all have the same idea in mind. So far as I am concerned, we are all tribals, whether we live in Delhi or Madras or Bombay or Calcutta or in the hills or in the plains. To call some people primitive and to think of ourselves as highly civilized is basically wrong. There are differences, of course. There are marked differences, for example, between the people of the Punjab and the people of Madras. There are differences between people living in the hills and people living in the plains. Geography and climate account for differences of food and clothing and living conditions. That is inevitable. We are very different, for example, from the Chinese or the Japanese, and yet, perhaps, there is something more in common between us and the Chinese and the Japanese than there might be between us and some people in Europe. On the other hand, there is something more in common between us and Europe in language. All this proves that differences

Inaugural address at the Tribal Affairs Conference, New Delhi, December 4, 1954

are of several kinds. But I am sure that to think of the tribals and non-tribals as people qualitatively different is wrong. Take the description in our Constitution of the Scheduled Castes. As you know, it is rather arbitrary. Government, after consideration, decide whether a particular caste is a Scheduled Caste or not. It is not possible to draw a hard and fast line. That is why we aim ultimately at removal of all these appellations, descriptions and names which ideologically and physically separate the people as the Depressed Classes, the Harijans, the Scheduled Castes, the Scheduled Tribes, and so on. Differences in customs and ways of living will continue to remain, because they are due to geography and climate. But this barrier of 'So and so belongs to a Scheduled Caste' should go.

There is at present a Backward Classes Commission sitting under the chairmanship of Kaka Kalelkar. Many of the Backward Classes are as backward as any of the Scheduled Castes. In fact, some are more backward. The essential problem therefore is to help all those who are backward. Let us recognize the fact that in India only a handful belong to the so-called superior class.

They are not necessarily different from the rest of the population but because they have had greater opportunities of growth, education, and better living conditions for generations and centuries they have assumed a relatively more important position in India. Inevitably, of course, some individuals go ahead of others. But it is not a good thing for castes and groups to be permanently installed in superior positions. Every individual should have openings and opportunities for advancement. The real problem thus is of raising the level of all depressed humanity in India, not this group or that group. We shall never succeed if we proceed group by group. That really brings us to the much wider problem of education and employment. We talk of basic education. We frequently adopt resolutions about it. The fact is that we have done very little about real basic education in the country.

All these general observations apply as much to tribals as to any other people. I want to stress that we must cease to think of our being different from the so-called tribal people.

This vicious idea and superiority complex must go. Many of the tribal people have reached a high degree of development. In fact, I found that in some places the tribal people are better educated and disciplined and lead a better corporate life than the caste-ridden society that we suffer from.

We in India are being powerfully affected by all kinds of world economic problems in what may be called a market economy. To succeed in that economy one needs certain qualities. Normally speaking, these tribal areas have not come within the scope of a market economy which is governed by the rule of the survival of the fittest. It has therefore become necessary, as our Constitution has laid down, that we should prevent the incursion of the market economy into these people's areas. We shall have to prevent rich people from acquiring land and dispossessing the tribal people. We do not want the economy of the tribal areas to be upset. We want the tribal areas to advance in peace.

Looking at areas outside India which are inhabited by so-called primitive people, we find that two things affect them injuriously : introduction of a market economy during the last century or so, and next the introduction of gin and other alcoholic drinks from Europe. These two served to put an end to their traditional handicrafts and arts. They gave up their simple ways of living and adopted the so-called European civilization, which was most disastrous. To some extent, there is danger of the so-called Indian civilization having a similar disastrous effect, if we do not apply proper checks.

It is obvious that the tribal areas have to progress. Nobody wants to keep them as museum specimens. It is equally obvious that they have to progress in their own way. They do not like something alien to be imposed upon them. No individual can grow in alien surroundings, habits, or customs. How are we going to reconcile these two considerations? There are two extreme approaches. One is the museum approach, keeping them as interesting specimens for anthropologists to discuss. The other may be called the 'open door' approach. Both are equally bad. The second approach attracts all the undesirables from outside who exploit these people economically and otherwise and take them out of their moorings. We have to

find a middle course. That can succeed only if there is no element of compulsion about it. That attempt has in fact to be made through their own people. The first thing, therefore, is to train their own people. That would be far more effective than for outsiders to work for them. We have to make them progress, but progress does not mean an attempt merely to duplicate what we have got in other parts of India. What is good in the rest of India will of course be adopted by them gradually. Imposition has to be absent as far as possible, and people have to be trained to train others. The progress may not be very rapid but we must remember that training takes time. Whatever profession you may adopt, engineering or medicine, it takes years to train people. It is better to go ahead on a systematic basis than by an 'odd job' approach.

PLACE OF PONDICHERRY

MY COMING here today after a number of years has brought many memories to me. It has, more particularly, brought before me the significance of all that has happened in Pondicherry during the last few months. What has happened here is of a much larger significance than the mere size of Pondicherry might indicate. From the point of view of India, it is a certain step forward in her political revolution. The big step was taken when India became free, after an agreement with the British Government. This is another step forward, however small.

We in India desire no domain outside our country. We have no ambitions to dominate over any people or any country. But we have to complete our own political revolution by bringing about the integration of these pockets in India. It is important that this step came about. Even more important is the manner of its coming about, that is, through

a friendly, negotiated settlement with the French Government. That settlement does honour to both the Government of India and the Government of the French Republic, as all true settlements always do.

Seven and a half years ago we came to a settlement with the British Government in regard to this great country of India. We had opposed each other for a long number of years and yet those in charge of the destinies of both countries were wise enough to seek the path of friendly settlement. As a result, the conflicts and the bitterness that had existed earlier almost vanished and we deal with each other as friends. It very seldom happens in history that a problem is solved without leaving other problems behind. Wars are fought and won and lost, but even the winning of the war does not end the problems that war creates. Every conflict leads to other conflicts even though that conflict ceases. How then did this happen that in India this solution of the problem between a great country like India and a great empire like the British Empire, took place in a manner that has left practically no problem and no bitterness behind? So also, in dealing with this question of Pondicherry, we have achieved a settlement in friendship and co-operation with the French Government, leaving no problem behind, not even bitterness.

That is the civilized way of dealing with problems. The uncivilized way is that of war, even though the so-called advanced countries may fight. Thus, while Pondicherry may be a very small part of India, Pondicherry has now become a symbol of friendly solution by negotiated settlement between nations. This settlement has truly brought joy and happiness to me, because I have laboured throughout my life for a certain objective in India. I have seen that objective fulfilled in a large measure and as more fulfilment comes to it, naturally I rejoice. And my joy has been much greater because of the manner of doing it. You may remember that our great leader, Mahatmaji, always laid stress on the manner of doing things, on the means employed. It is good to have a right objective, to have right ends in view, but he always said that it is more important to adopt right methods and right means.

I thank you very much for your welcome, Mr. Mayor, and I thank the other organizations who have extended it. It seems to me both from the welcome here and from the welcome I have received in the streets of Pondicherry, that almost all the people of Pondicherry, to whatever group or way of thought they might belong, have joined in it. That makes me glad, but it casts a burden of responsibility on me also, which I cannot fulfil without your co-operation. What does this welcome mean, more especially the welcome of the common people in the streets, who do not know how to spin fine phrases but whose affection looks out of their eyes? It means an expectation, a hope, a faith in the future. How are we going to fulfil that hope and the expectation? How are we going to lighten their burdens, and bring some relief and some joy to their harassed lives? That is a question which all of us have to think about. How to answer the question that these millions and millions of eyes put to us, friendly eyes, pleading eyes, sometimes sad eyes, is a problem for the whole of India.

We have to think of the future of Pondicherry in terms of the common people of Pondicherry more than in terms of any edict. We have arrived at a stage in India and in the world when nobody dare ignore the common man.

You referred, Mr. Mayor, to the individuality of Pondicherry. You are right. In the course of the last two or three hundred years, these settlements, Pondicherry, Karaikal, etc., have acquired a certain individuality and a certain impress of French culture and the French language. You know that we have stated in our Agreement with the French Republic that we shall respect that French culture and the impress of French language and customs here.

That itself involves our treating Pondicherry, Karaikal, and the other places somewhat differently from the way we may treat other parts of India. We wish to recognize your individuality not merely because we have come to an agreement on that score with the Government of France, but even more so because we feel that that is good for you and for India. India is a country of great size and variety. I have travelled in India from the northern mountains right down to the south. I see that behind this infinite variety of India

there is a certain unity that binds it. Variety enriches our culture, but only when there is a strong bond of unity also. I look upon Pondicherry with its background of French culture and language as something that enriches Indian culture. It is something that I should like to preserve. French is one of the great languages of the world; it is a very beautiful language, and we should welcome it. I should like Pondicherry to continue to be the seat of the French language. It can serve India in that manner. I need not say much more to you except that the justification of what will happen in future will depend on how we serve the common man of Pondicherry. The future of Pondicherry might depend to some extent on us sitting in Delhi or our officers here, but it will depend far more on the people of Pondicherry, on you gentlemen, and others here, and on how far you can co-operate together for the common good.

We live in an age of democracy, and India is committed to the democratic ideal. For the first time in history we were brave and courageous enough to give the vote to hundreds of millions of people of India. We gave the vote to the dwellers in the jungle, even as to the dwellers in the cities. We did not deny the vote to any person in India. We did not attach any property qualifications or educational tests. We treated everyone as a human being, with a right to say what his Government should be. So we put our faith in democracy to the fullest extent. And democracy only flourishes, as freedom only flourishes, when the responsibilities of freedom are understood and carried out. If the responsibilities are not understood and carried out, then freedom itself tends to slip away. There is no right without a corresponding responsibility and obligation. We claim rights, but we forget the obligations that accompany the rights and such rights will not be a blessing to us, and may even be a curse.

Now that you have come into the larger freedom you have to remember the obligations and the responsibilities of that freedom. You have to remember that democracy means co-operation. It means adjustment, it often means compromise of different viewpoints, and it means avoidance of conflict. We are not going to build anything through conflict

and violence. If you work together, I can assure you that you will have the fullest help and co-operation from our officers here. Just before I came to you, I met our officers here, and I spoke to them in the same terms as I am speaking to you. To be an officer is not merely to draw a salary. Every officer is a trustee to a certain extent, as everyone of you, whether you are the mayor or councillor, is a trustee of this city. We have come together and I hope our co-operation will be fruitful.

ON BUILDING A BEAUTIFUL CITY

THE CORPORATION OF BANGALORE, I should imagine, is a rather proud body, proud to have this lovely city in its charge. Bangalore is very fortunately situated, and it is natural that now that India has been free for some years, Bangalore, more perhaps than any other city in India, should grow rapidly in the modern sense of the word, that is, in industry, in science and in technology. Bangalore, of course, will represent the old times also. And so it becomes that ideal combination of a city having its roots firmly grounded in the soil of our own culture and yet growing out and throwing out its branches into the modern world.

Bangalore has been a great and attractive city. There are many attractive buildings but what has attracted me most in Bangalore, have been the trees; and whenever I come here, I feast my eyes upon them. Not only here, but in Mysore city also. You have certain natural advantages and it is right that you should try to set up noble buildings. You should not accept or tolerate ugliness anywhere, in your life, in your activities, in your buildings. The worst type of ugliness of course is ugly behaviour of individuals and groups. But to some extent, the environment reflects itself in the behaviour of the individual, as a beautiful environment helps in developing a sense of beauty in the people who live there. It is

Speech at the laying of the foundation stone of the new Corporation building at Bangalore, October 6, 1955

desirable, therefore, that what we build, however simple and humble it may be, should have some artistic value. And mind you, do not connect artistic values with money. Certainly, big buildings cost money. But a touch of artistry does not cost money, or costs very little. It really needs some imagination and some love of beauty in the men who build them. You can make the humblest cottage attractive and beautiful even though it might be a mud cottage, and you can make a big palace a thing of horror. One often sees in India, recently erected, horrible buildings, big buildings, costly buildings, painful to look at. It is not a question of money, but a sense of artistry. So far as great public buildings are concerned, they do become expensive because they are big. They have to be enduring, and to some extent symbolic also. I have no idea how this structure, of which the foundation stone is going to be laid soon, will look. But I have no doubt that your engineers, your architects and your planners will pay attention to this aspect. May I suggest that in more of our great public buildings we should encourage our young artists, our young sculptors and our young painters to embellish them?

You referred, Mr. Mayor, in your address to the rapid growth of the City of Bangalore and to the horrid fact that your slums are growing. Slums are a disease, which if not checked immediately, might well overshadow the beauty of Bangalore. There is no reason why slums should be allowed to grow. It is bad enough to inherit slums. But to allow them to grow is your own fault and your city's fault and your population's fault and your Government's fault and our fault. They should not be allowed to grow. I believe in no industrial development which comes at the cost of slums. If industry has to come here, each industry must make it its own particular and special responsibility to see that it will not cause any more slums and that it provides enough accommodation for its workers. I believe in no argument, economic or other, which is based on the creation of slums. I have a horror of slums. I don't mind a person living in the open like a vagabond or a gipsy. I am a bit of a vagabond myself, and I like vagabonds and gipsies. I don't mind a person living in a mud hut. But I do mind slums in cities; and I have often said if

you cannot provide buildings for those dwelling in slums, give them an open space to live in, and give them at least some social services, like good sanitation and water supply. The rest will follow.

I find from your address that you are not abundantly supplied with water. In a city like Bangalore, rapidly growing, very particular attention has to be paid to how it grows. I see that some kind of a committee or commission has been appointed to think of the future of Greater Bangalore. I am glad at that. But I should like to know a little more of how that committee is going to function. We have many Improvement Trusts in our big cities in India, but I confess I am not too happy with their approach to the question of the development of their cities. They may be doing good work, but they could function better. What I should like in regard to every city is a clear plan of what the city will be like, say, twenty or thirty years later. And then you can work by that plan slowly, gradually. Nothing should be allowed to come in the way of that plan, as has happened, for example, in our city of Delhi. Amazing structures have been put up in a haphazard manner all over Delhi and they come in our way now and in future. Therefore, prepare a master plan for Bangalore as it should be twenty or thirty years later. Every little thing that is built by public authority or private persons must fit in with that master plan and nobody should be allowed to spoil it. Have broad avenues and streets. In Delhi, I find that people have put up narrow streets which are totally insufficient even now. They might have been good enough in old times, and it is difficult to widen the streets when you have big buildings on either side. But if you plan in advance, you can have wide avenues and streets. You have a magnificent opportunity here in Bangalore, not only to do your primary duty of looking after the citizens and the residents of Bangalore by giving them the amenities of civic life like healthy conditions, education, parks, libraries, and so on, but of building up in this ideal spot a beautiful city, beautiful not only to look at, but beautiful and healthy to live in.

ON TRAVEL AND TOURISM

I HAVE GREAT PLEASURE in joining my colleague, the Transport Minister of the Government of India, in welcoming you to Delhi for this important conference. I suppose the word 'tourist' means a person who tours. I tour a lot, but people do not call me a tourist. However, as my colleague has just said, it is a remarkable social phenomenon of the times to see vast numbers of people travelling all round the globe, seeing other parts of the world and enriching their own mental outlook and horizon thereby.

Tourism is intimately connected with the growth of communications. One view of world history would be to look at this growth of communications, particularly in the last two hundred years or so. Before that, one might say, communications had been static for thousands of years. The fastest means of transport or communication was probably a swift horse. Then, suddenly, came various changes as a consequence of the Industrial Revolution, and the pace of change became faster and faster. This growth of communications has brought the whole world much closer. Almost every country now sits at the doorstep of other countries however far they may be. That is the physical change brought about by science. How far we have kept pace mentally with that physical change I do not know. Probably we have not kept pace with it, and hence some of our difficulties in international affairs. Politically, economically and otherwise, we function as national entities and independent governments, even coming into occasional conflict with one another. How far this fits in with the new world, with its highly-developed communications, is for you to think over. We have not advanced as far in the political and economic field as in the field of communications, and if this hiatus is not bridged, wrong consequences will flow from it.

One way to bridge that gulf is through people getting to know other countries and other peoples. Despite the great

Speech inaugurating the tenth General Assembly session of the International Union of Official Travel Organizations, New Delhi, October 19, 1955

differences, there are certain basic factors common to all humanity, and common problems facing all people. Apart from their other advantages and pleasures, travel and tourism, I think, serve a much wider human purpose which is becoming increasingly important as the world becomes more and more closely knit together by communications. People talk of One World. While it is still a distant ideal from the political point of view, it is a reality from the point of view of communications.

As I said, although I travel a lot, I am not properly a tourist. I often wonder what impressions a person gathers when he goes to another country. Is that person's mind a closed mind or a receptive mind? Is it made up or can it learn new things? I suppose in every country there are things an outsider likes and many others that he dislikes because he is not accustomed to them. Much depends on how receptive he is. He will see, of course, the big buildings and the artistic treasures. But a country can be understood only by understanding its people and their background—not so much by its archaeological monuments and the like. This is particularly true in the present transitional phase of world history. I have read a large number of travel books, old and new, but the old ones fascinate me. I have read about the travels of Marco Polo who took about two and a half years travelling from Venice to China and two and a half years more crossing Asia. While crossing Asia, he spent a great deal of time understanding the customs of the various peoples and learning their languages. By the time he came to the end of his journey, he had learnt an immense lot about the countries he had visited.

Nowadays people hop from one place to another by air. They find themselves in a new physical and mental climate, and it becomes exceedingly hard for them to make the necessary adjustments. Possibly they cannot adjust themselves even to the food that they get. I wonder if it is not more profitable to travel as Marco Polo did than as we do now. My own personal inclination would be in favour of Marco Polo, but we cannot go back to Marco Polo's age. Still we might at least develop receptivity and adaptability to some

extent. We must attempt to understand other people's point of view. The difficulty is that we are so fixed in our own habits and viewpoints that the others' habits and viewpoints appear to us absurd, ridiculous and sometimes even mischievous. The feeling rather is, "Why can't they agree with us?" This is not a civilized outlook. The whole purpose of travel is to remove parochialism in our thought and in our approach to the external world. I believe therefore that travel is a powerful factor in helping to reduce difficulties in the way of people coming together. Travel organizations should devote themselves to this high purpose.

I remember that in my boyhood days one did not require passports or visas; one went wherever one wanted to go. That state of affairs ended with the First World War. Since then the tendency has been to become stricter and stricter. Visas, health regulations and all kinds of other restrictions have made travel an extraordinarily complicated phenomenon in spite of the great facilities in the modes of travel. Health rules are necessary, of course, but I do hope that restrictions such as visas will become easier at least, if they cannot be abolished. The idea of visas is obviously to keep out the undesirables. But I imagine that the real undesirables somehow manage to get into a country in spite of the visas. It is the honest people who often get kept out. My own Government has a visa system like the other Governments and I struggle with my own authorities on the issue of visas. I do hope that the time will come when these various restrictions on international travel will be reduced to a minimum.

What does a tourist come to see in India? It is entirely for the individual tourist to determine, because there are many aspects of India. India is so vast and so ancient a country, that the tourist has to pick and choose. He can, of course, look at a cross-section of something at once very old and very new. We are, in a sense, more interested in the new than in the old, but we are ourselves the products of the old. The old is in us and around us, but our faces are turned towards building the new India. If you want to have some idea of what is passing through our minds, you will have to see the new India even more than the old. You may go, for example,

to Banaras, which is, I believe, one of the oldest cities not only in India but possibly in the world, sharing that honour with a few others like Damascus. It has been a continuing city. Delhi is not a continuing city in that sense, though it has been the site of great cities for a great many centuries. This New Delhi, where you are now meeting, is the eighth city. The present Old Delhi is the seventh city, and around these two are the remains of six Delhis. Banaras, on the other hand, has been important continuously throughout our history. We hear reports of its importance as a city of culture even 3,000 years ago. The Buddha, 2,500 years ago, chose Banaras to deliver his First Sermon, because Banaras was a city of learning and culture. If you now went to Banaras, you would see a somewhat picturesque city on the river banks but you would see many other things which are very unattractive. You would react in either of two ways. I do not of course like the unattractive side of Banaras, but when I go to Banaras, I see a series of pictures which arise in my mind and depict the past history of Banaras. The city becomes to me a picture gallery of historical things. It is natural for a visitor to like certain places and certain people and dislike others. But it is essential to know the background before forming judgments. It is difficult for a casual tourist to get all this background. I myself want to get this background right whenever I go to a foreign country. I am chiefly interested in two things, first, the background of that country, and secondly the people. I am less interested in buildings, old or new, and the normal sights of a place. The great architectural or cultural accomplishments of a people interest me as part of the background that has thrown up the nation. These considerations might at best apply to a limited number of visitors and tourists, but probably those limited numbers profit more by their travels than those who rush here and there and have a rather mixed and hazy memory of the various things they see. Even then, travel is good. Travel is better still if the traveller goes out with a receptive and friendly mind, and travel is best of all if he is not only an ambassador of his own country but comes back from that other country as an ambassador of that country to his own.

Then travel has fulfilled its function. I hope that your Union of Travel Organizations will succeed in your efforts to remove restrictions and encourage travel in the right way and in the right spirit and take many people from one country to the other, and to our country, and thus increase the feeling of good fellowship.

OPPORTUNITY FOR YOUTH

YOU KNOW that I once wrote a book called *The Discovery of India*. I was engaged in that quest long before I wrote that book. It was not mere curiosity that led me to that quest. I was engaged in many activities and I wanted a proper reconciliation between my activity and my thought. Thought without action is abortion. Action without thought is folly.

Of course, we sometimes act on some impulse or irrepressible urge. If suddenly you throw a brick at me and my hand goes up to protect myself, it is an automatic, instinctive action and not a result of deliberate thought. Our living is conditioned by a series of automatic actions from morning till night. Anything we do outside that common range of actions, however, has to be preceded by some measure of thinking. The more action and thought are allied and integrated, the more effective they become and the happier you grow. There will then be no inner conflict between a wish to do something and inability to act or between thinking one way and acting in another. The happiest man is he whose thinking and action are co-ordinated.

Happiness, after all, is an inner state of mind. It is little dependent on outside environment. Happiness has very little to do, for instance, with whether you are rich or not rich. Some of the most miserable persons I have come across in my life are the rich people. It is true that poverty makes one miserable in a very acute way. But my point is that it is not

Address at the second Inter-University Youth Festival, New Delhi, October 23, 1955

wealth but co-ordination of one's thought and action which removes inner conflicts. It is in that way that integration of personality is achieved.

We were engaged, as you know, in a very great movement in India. Because that movement was intimately concerned with the freedom of India, I was led to wonder what exactly is India. I knew, of course, the geography of India. I knew many other odd facts about India, too. I was not prepared to accept it on faith that because I was born in India, therefore India was the greatest country in the world. That is the kind of folly in which the people of every country indulge.

There are quite enough people in India who think that India is obviously the greatest country. In the days when we were politically subject and could not take much pride in our political condition, we prided ourselves on our spiritual greatness. Having nothing else to get hold of we took refuge in spirituality.

If you go to other countries—I shall not name them as I do not wish to cause offence—you will find the people there think that their country is the chosen country, the torch-bearer of civilization, the most advanced country, the most revolutionary country, the country with the biggest buildings, the country with something unique, some mission or other. It is natural for one to like one's own country and one's own people. It would be unnatural not to do so. It is good to be a little proud of one's own country. But it is wrong to start imagining that we are the highest and the best in the world. The fact is that every country and every people have admirable points about them; they have great achievements to their credit, and they have also bad periods in their history. This applies not to countries only but to individuals. Nobody is perfect; he has weaknesses and failings. Nobody is thoroughly bad either. We are all mixtures of good and evil. But we should try to further the good in ourselves and in others.

Most of you probably did not see Gandhiji at close quarters. He had amazing qualities. One of these qualities was that he managed to draw out the good in another person. The other person may have had plenty of evil in him. But he somehow spotted the good and laid emphasis on that good. The

result was that that poor man had to try to be good. He could not help it. He would feel a little ashamed when he did something wrong.

People who always seek evil in others find it. This applies to nations as well as individuals. Go to a foreign country. You are likely to find many things that you do not like. Are you going to spend your time finding out the evil in other countries, or rather in finding out the good in them, and profiting yourself and others by your contact?

We are all much too apt to look at the evil in other individuals and countries rather than the good. Perhaps some of you know the saying in the Bible about the person who could not see the beam in his own eye and saw the mote in the other's eye. I am sorry if you think I am rambling. But this is, I might inform you in secret, a very clever attempt to get behind your mind. I am at least being frank with you.

That is how I came to write *The Discovery of India*. And before that, I wrote my autobiography, which again was an attempt to fix myself in the context of the Indian struggle. Actually the book was more about the struggle in India than about myself. Of course, I was naturally a kind of central figure from my point of view as everybody is from his point of view. Then I wanted a larger canvas to think about and I wrote *Glimpses of World History*. I am no historian. Perhaps that was as well, because there are very few historians that I know who can talk intelligently about history. They are so full of facts and figures that they are overwhelmed by them. They are lost in a forest and do not see some obvious things because they are always crawling about in the underwood. I wrote *Glimpses of World History* in order that I might see my country and my age in the proper perspective of world history. It was by no means a deep work. But it gave my thinking the framework of world history.

Having got the larger frame, I looked more closely at my own country and wrote *The Discovery of India*. In it I concentrated on my country's past and the story of its development.

I am trying to explain to you how my thinking developed in these matters. The more I thought and the more I learnt the more I saw how little I knew and how much more there

was to learn. One of my regrets today is that I have no time to pursue these studies properly by reading or thinking or writing, because writing for me is essentially an aid to thinking. In trying to write, one has to think more concisely than otherwise.

I suppose I must not complain of my present lot. What I would like you to do first of all is to think. Thinking is something which does not come automatically to a person. Gossiping with a neighbour is not thought. If you repeat something which somebody else has said, it is not thought. I do not expect all of you to become mighty thinkers, though some of you may. But I would like all of you to think and to develop the art of thinking. Nothing is more helpful to thinking than reading, that is, reading intelligently, because thereby you get other people's thoughts, and by weighing them you can think yourself. I have often said that it is very unfortunate that people think and read so little nowadays, especially in India. I do not call newspaper-reading reading. But any reading which makes you think is useful reading, even if it is a very good novel. Great novels always make one think, because they are pictures of life painted by great minds.

If you think about the Five-Year Plans, you will find what a vital part the engineer plays in them. We shall require tens of thousands of engineers and hundreds of thousands of overseers, mechanics, and other technicians for our Plans. The whole world is becoming more and more a world of trained people. They need to be trained in two ways. They must be trained in mind, and have some vision and understanding of the world picture. Then they must be trained in particular jobs which they can do well, whether it be science or engineering or medicine or education. Such are the skills which will build India.

Frankly, the job of the politician will not build India, although I speak as a politician. A politician is a useful person in his own way, though it is conceivable that in a perfect society the politician will fade away. But it is not conceivable that the experts will fade away. There will be always need for the engineer and the scientist. They cannot fade away even if the politician may fade away. However, I do not think the time is near when the politician will fade away.

You are young. I should like you to have the pride of youth and the ambition of youth to do something worthwhile and big. All of you may not be geniuses, but some of you might yet do worthwhile things in some department of human activity or other. I do not like people who have no pride and ambition and are just sloppy people.

I am not using the words pride and ambition in a small personal sense. I do not mean the pride of getting money, which is the silliest of all types of pride. Pride should consist in doing your job in the best possible manner. If you are a scientist, think of becoming an Einstein, not merely a reader in your university. If you are a medical man, think of some discovery which will bring healing to the human race. If you are an engineer, aim at some new invention. The mere act of aiming at something big makes you big.

If my colleagues and I and others who function on the public stage today appear big leaders to you, look back on how we became so. We may have had some virtue and some ability, but essentially we became what we were because we had some ambition and pride, because we hitched our wagon to a star, because we tried to do big things and in so trying our stature increased a little.

It is not what you say that matters, but what you do. Think therefore of the vast opportunities that the world offers to those who are keen of mind, strong of character and fleet of foot. Think of the opportunities that India offers. I know better than you of the difficult problems of India, the suffering and misery of numberless people. We are trying to meet those problems and solve them, not by magic but by strong will and hard work. There is no magic in this world except the occasional magic of human personality and the human mind. It takes time and perseverance to do big things. It will not do to be faint-hearted. One meets with failure occasionally, but one has yet to go on. Success does not come suddenly or without setbacks. So you have these great opportunities in India. Prepare yourself for them; grow strong in mind and body. Have that inner urge to do big things and I have no doubt that you will do big things.

TWO FRIENDS OF INDIA

MY MIND GOES BACK to another occasion when I stood up at this table to propose a toast to Lord and Lady Mountbatten. That was nearly eight years ago. It was rather a sad occasion for all of us because we were parting from two persons who had become our friends, who had grown into our lives and activities. And when I think of other occasions, many other pictures come up before my mind of that rather hectic period during which we faced many problems and difficulties together.

I remember the first occasion when I met Lord Mountbatten. That was almost exactly ten years ago in Singapore. I met Lady Mountbatten slightly later the same day and that was in a rather remarkable fashion. And perhaps this meeting with Lady Mountbatten was some kind of a prelude to many other upsets that we had to face later. If I may, with her permission, take you into my confidence, I was taken by Lord Mountbatten to an Indian soldiers' canteen in Singapore. Well, the Indian soldiers were lined up very properly but within about two or three minutes of our arrival, there was some kind of stampede. Lady Mountbatten disappeared and I was much worried about what had happened to her. Then she crawled out and presented herself, and that was my first introduction to her.

Nearly nine years ago, in this very month of March, the Mountbattens arrived here and we went to welcome them at Palam Airport. That day started a new chapter in our history and in our activities. Now, history is often said to be a record of big people, kings, leaders, captains and the like, and of great battles. That is an out-of-date idea of history and nowadays we think more of the great and rather impersonal forces at play, which mould the destinies of nations and peoples. Nevertheless, I think it is true that the individual does make a difference, more specially during times of transition. It so happened that during a rather significant period of India's history, Lord Mountbatten came here as Viceroy, subse-

Speech at Banquet for the Earl and Countess Mountbatten, New Delhi, March 15, 1956

quently transformed himself into a Governor-General, and played a very important and vital part.

It was a brief period, sixteen months altogether, but those months saw great changes. They saw the end of British rule here and started independent India on her new career. During this brief period, Lord Mountbatten and Lady Mountbatten played a part which, if I may say so, nobody else could have played. I have little doubt that if Lord Mountbatten had not been here during that period, something different might well have happened. But I am not talking politics today. What I remember most of all is that during a period when passions were roused all over India, and in what is called Pakistan now, when all kinds of horrible things occurred, Lord Mountbatten survived, not physically, but in the estimation and affection of the people. This was a remarkable thing indeed. All of us who functioned in those days had to face severe trials and tests, but Lord Mountbatten came out of every trial and test successfully. And as for Lady Mountbatten, she became so popular with our people because of the healing touch she brought wherever she went, that some of us became somewhat jealous of her.

Apart from the personal factor, another thing stands out and that is, after a very long period of conflict and pulling in different directions, we, Britain and India, solved our problem amicably and in a way which left hardly any trace of that past record of conflict and ill will. That, I think, was a remarkable achievement. Of course, the person who was responsible for this in the greatest measure was our Leader and Master, Gandhiji, who had trained this great nation to behave, and not to harbour ill will. We did not all come up to this test, but some little bit of that discipline and training remained in us and saved us often enough. And yet this could not have been so if there had not been an equal measure of response from the other side. Even when there is an attempt to meet as friends some kind of catalytic agent has to bring about that meeting of minds. Lord Mountbatten proved to be such an agent at a very critical period of our history. And so we saw this remarkable development of India, which had been in conflict with Britain, rather suddenly becoming

friends with her and forgetting or almost forgetting the past record of conflict and ill will. And when two or three years later we became a Republic, still it did not make any difference to that relationship because that relationship was not based on any hoops of steel or ropes. It was a relationship of free will, without even silken bonds. And because there was nothing to tie, there was nothing to break it. We see often enough today all kinds of strong bonds being forged to tie one country to another, bonds of iron and steel. And yet that iron breaks and even the steel melts away. In a moment of crisis, the bond is not so strong as it looks. The manner of relationship which was evolved between India and England is of a different kind and different texture. Because we had known each other both in conflict and in co-operation, and had settled our conflicts in a civilized, human way, we have survived many things, many differences of opinion. That is because we fundamentally wished for and developed the mood to co-operate as far as possible and to co-operate even if we differed. It is a little difficult to define that relationship because it is indefinable, and it is often the indefinable things that are the most important and the most precious of all.

This world grows better in some ways and in some it grows less gracious. Somehow people have preferred to talk not in gentle terms to each other but rather toughly. All of us, I suppose, are a mixture of toughness and gentleness but it is unfortunate that in international relations the ideal of toughness prevails a little more than the ideal of graciousness and gentleness. Perhaps if we could bring a little more gentleness and charity into our dealings with each other, even our differences would become much less and ways could be found to resolve them. A relationship based on a friendly approach, a civilized approach, has a certain element of permanence from which even ill fortune cannot take away. I believe that that type of relationship is a much more enduring one, a much better one because it injures none, harms none and sets an example to others of good and civilized behaviour.

Lord Mountbatten is undoubtedly one of the principal architects of the relationship between India and England today, and therefore he has served not only his country well,

not only India well, but many others also. We of course have long ceased to look upon him and Lady Mountbatten as strangers or as people belonging to some other country and not to us. His coming here after so many years has been a special occasion for us to look back on events which stirred us and moved us deeply and conditioned us for the future. It has been a great pleasure to me to welcome him. We have welcomed Lady Mountbatten on many occasions when she came here quietly, informally and in a friendly fashion.

PROFILE OF A FIGHTER

K. G. SAIYIDAIN: Panditji, people who had come in contact with your illustrious father remember two outstanding traits of his personality. They remember him as a man of great resolution and strong convictions and also as one who cultivated the most refined tastes and savoured the cultured graces of life. Could you tell us something to illustrate how these two qualities blended into his personality?

PRIME MINISTER: It is very difficult for me to discuss my father. He created, naturally, a very great impression upon me, not only because he was my father but because he was what he was. I remember, after his death, among the many tributes paid to him, the Chief Justice of a High Court, an Englishman, said about him that wherever he sat at a table became the head of the table.

SAIYIDAIN: Very well put . . .

PRIME MINISTER: Or you might say, whenever he went to a gathering he became, in a sense, the centre of that gathering. He was a link, a bridge, or call it what you like, between different phases of history and social development. He combined in himself very much the mixed culture of Northern India affected by the new culture of the West. But more important than all these cultural accomplishments,

which played an important part in his life, no doubt, was his personality.

SAIYIDAIN: What would you regard as the most dominant trait of his personality?

PRIME MINISTER: He became a successful lawyer by perseverance, not because he was helped by others. In a sense he was a self-made man. I have no doubt that he would have succeeded in any other activity of life which he might have undertaken. In normal times he remained a very successful lawyer, maybe a successful politician, too. But in abnormal times he would have also risen to the top. Maybe in times of trouble, in earlier days, he might have been a captain and a founder of some principality.

SAIYIDAIN: Intriguing thought!

PRIME MINISTER: He was something like a Renaissance prince. As it was, he came in contact with an overpowering personality like Gandhi and the new movement, the new historic sweep that came to India with Gandhi. It was, I have no doubt, a tremendous struggle for him to uproot himself and to fit himself into this new environment.

SAIYIDAIN: And he was able to do it successfully?

PRIME MINISTER: Yes, he faced that struggle and ultimately came to the decision that he must participate in it fully because that answered to another important call on him, that is, his pride, his dignity, his refusal to submit, whether as an individual or a member of a group. And so he became, while remaining himself, a completely changed individual.

SAIYIDAIN: And a part of this new big national movement that was developing?

PRIME MINISTER: A part, of course, but something much more than a part. Democracy is, on the whole, a great leveller. . .

SAIYIDAIN: That is true. . .

PRIME MINISTER: . . .and a person like my father might have been in an ordinary democratic age a successful politician, a Prime Minister. But there are many Prime Ministers and many successful politicians and he had something far more than that, because of his strong will, his strong urge to succeed in whatever he undertook.

SAIYIDAIN: Now, Sir, if I may ask you, what would you regard as his most important contribution in the building up of this new India that has been going on?

PRIME MINISTER: I don't know. The new India was essentially made by Gandhiji's movement. But my father brought into that movement a new type, which was that strong, dominant type, which might have succeeded in any department of life, and, I think, it did make a tremendous difference that that type came in because that type is rare.

SAIYIDAIN: You mean the type that preserved its full individuality and was yet a part of this great movement?

PRIME MINISTER: Yes, that is, he preserved his individuality, was a part of the movement, and, I have no doubt, had some influence on Gandhiji himself. I might tell you that so far as I am personally concerned the three men who have influenced me most in my life have been my father, Gandhiji and Rabindranath Tagore. The first two more than the last one, because I came in contact with Tagore rather late when I had been conditioned, more or less, by my father and Gandhiji. Nevertheless, Rabindranath had a very considerable influence on me. It is interesting to remember that my father and Rabindranath Tagore were born on the same day, month and year.

SAIYIDAIN: It's most interesting indeed and it would appear as if your father had something of the great cultural qualities of Rabindranath Tagore. . .

PRIME MINISTER: ah. . .well. . .

SAIYIDAIN: . . . and the national urges that prompted Gandhiji in his work.

PRIME MINISTER: National urges, of course, were a common factor to all these three. But I doubt if you could find three persons who were so entirely different from one another as Gandhiji, my father and Rabindranath, and yet there were these enormous bonds and links in their thought and action, and, to some extent, in culture too, although, again, there are so many facets of culture that it takes different shape in different individuals.

SAIYIDAIN: I thought socially and culturally he would be nearer to Rabindranath Tagore.

PRIME MINISTER: Of course, he would be, obviously.

SAIYIDAIN: Could you tell us something which you would regard as a cherished moment in your association with your father? It's a very personal question, I know.

PRIME MINISTER: I have so many memories of him, vivid memories. But I think I remember most the last time I saw him when he visited me in Naini Prison, just a few days before his death. He was terribly ill and his face showed it. But throughout that brief interview his strong and dominant will not to give in to illness or death was apparent. He refused to recognize it and almost conveyed to me the impression that he would refuse to die, whatever happened.

SAIYIDAIN: He was essentially a great fighter.

PRIME MINISTER: He was a great fighter and specially a fighter when there were odds against him.

ANCIENT AND MODERN MEDICINE

I HAVE HAD the honour of receiving a fairly large number of honorary degrees, chiefly from universities, but this is the first time that a distinguished College of Medicine and Surgery has tried to envelop me in its fold. I feel a little as if I was in the shoes of somebody else. I feel rather nervous, lest ignorant people should come to me for treatment.

I must say that these doctorates, which are of so many kinds and varieties, are very confusing. I believe, that in Germany they distinguish between a medical doctor, a legal doctor, and a doctor of philosophy and so on, even in common speech. A person I knew, an American himself, once came back to my home-town of Allahabad with a degree from America. When I asked him what he got his doctorate in, he said he was a Doctor of Philanthropy. So, all these doctorates are very confusing to the layman, especially in India where doctors are taken to be medical men.

Address at a special convocation of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, Bombay, June 1, 1956

Long ago, when I was still practising at the Bar in Allahabad, a colleague of mine who later became the Chief Justice of the Allahabad High Court, Dr. Sulaiman, had a good practice. And another person who was rather jealous of his good practice let it be known privately to all kinds of people that Dr. Sulaiman was really some kind of a veterinary doctor.

In your preliminary remarks, you have referred to the need to provide large numbers of medical men and women for our vast rural areas. That is a very important and vital need. The difficulty comes in because we do not have enough people who have gone through the five- or six-year course. You referred to shorter courses of training. I do not quite know whether that means that people do not go through the full course and are not therefore fully qualified, or if you propose to produce qualified men in some compressed course. Nobody, I take it, certainly not members of your College, would like lower standards at all. But the problem, nevertheless, is how to provide medical care for the large numbers of people in our villages when we do not have and cannot produce in the near future an adequate number of fully trained people.

It has been suggested that there might be shorter courses, to produce not fully qualified doctors, but people who might be called assistant doctors, assistants to doctors, who would function in an area attached to some fully qualified doctor, and who could refer to him the serious cases. This is a matter to be considered.

The other question that often arises in India and is mentioned in our Parliament is the place of what are called our indigenous systems of medicine, the Ayurvedic and the Unani. I do not know what most of you think of these systems of medicine. I have no doubt that our systems of medicine made very considerable progress on what might broadly be called scientific lines. In fact, at one time schools of medicine and surgery in India were possibly as advanced as any in the wide world, if not more. I remember reading many years ago about Haroun Al-Raschid sending for an eminent physician from the University of Takshasila. Arab medicine was by no means backward in those days. But later our

indigenous systems became rather rigid and lost the capacity to advance.

How do we now take advantage of such accumulated experience as the country might possess in regard to indigenous systems of medicine? I have no doubt that there is much in that accumulated experience so far as curative remedies such as herbs and applications are concerned. But I am equally convinced that if we are to progress at all we must adhere strictly to scientific methods. The Ayurvedic and Unani systems can be utilized only in so far as they put themselves in line with scientific methods. I am glad that in some places in India, more especially in Jamnagar, an attempt has been made to that end. I do not see why there should be so much argument about this question once it is acknowledged that we must proceed on scientific lines. Science is not a closed system. It is an open method of discovering the truth, wherever it may be found. It consists in discarding former errors when new truths are discovered. You must be open-minded, therefore, and not sit in your ivory tower, thinking that only you have a glimpse of the truth and nobody else. You should adhere strictly to the methods and processes of science. Having done that, you can examine everything and profit by it.

Medical services have to be expanded in this country. How is it going to be done? I have little doubt that the only way it can be done effectively is through the State taking it up. I believe in the State being connected with medical services much more intimately and deeply. I want our medical services to be free to every individual who lives in the country. At present, in spite of good hospitals, the poor man does not always get the same treatment as the rich man does. Many of them hardly get any treatment at all, and they cannot afford the very expensive drugs that are used more and more in modern medicine. These people must get proper treatment; and they must get the drugs they need. If this is to come about, two things are essential. First, that the service itself should be organized on a State basis so as to provide free medical attention. Secondly, that the major drugs should, by and large, be manufactured by the State as a State enterprise.

In fact, there are few such rackets in the commercial world as the manufacture and sale of drugs at tremendous profits.

I am glad that we have put up an antibiotics factory for the manufacture of penicillin. Here in Bombay you have had the Haffkine Institute which has done such good work. I might inform you that we are intending to put up other State concerns for the large-scale manufacture of drugs. I am sure that these will make drugs available to almost anybody who requires them at prices they can pay.

TRIBUTE TO TILAK

A LITTLE OVER two weeks ago, I had the privilege of unveiling a portrait of Lokmanya Tilak in India House in London. It was fitting that that portrait should reside in the heart of London in a corner which belongs to India. But perhaps no more fitting place could be found for a portrait of Lokmanya than this Central Hall of our Parliament. Standing here and looking at the face of this indomitable warrior and scholar, I feel moved and I think of the century of struggle that this country has passed through, of the giants of old who laid the foundations of the freedom of India, and above all, of Lokmanya.

We have, to my right here, the picture of Dadabhai Naoroji, in a sense the Father of the Indian National Congress. We may perhaps in our youthful arrogance think that some of these leaders of old were very Moderate, and that we are braver because we shout more. But every person who can recapture the picture of old India and of the conditions that prevailed, will realize that a man like Dadabhai was, in those conditions, a revolutionary figure. If I say that of Dadabhai Naoroji, how much more can I not say about Lokmanya?

I had vaguely imagined, because from my early boyhood

Speech while unveiling a portrait of Lokmanya Tilak in the Central Hall of Parliament, July 28, 1956

I had heard of him, and throughout our youth all of us had come under his spell, that when he died Lokmanya must have reached an advanced age. And then, when I calculated the dates, I was surprised to find that at the time of his death he was much younger than I am today. But in those crowded years of a life not too long lived he put in such exceptional energy, ability, strength and sacrifice that it seems a very long life. Time, after all, is not measured by the passing of years but by what one does, what one feels and what one achieves. We have in Lokmanya a symbol of India's struggle for freedom, and the example of a man who was not only a brave soldier but a great captain, not a captain of some organized group but a captain who had to deal with an India which was rather amorphous, not well organized, and not even politically very conscious. Although some young men of those days had a feeling of freedom, we were in those days mostly non-political and rather frustrated. We accepted our dismal fate as destined. To shake up people from their inertia and to bring about mass consciousness, mass-awakening and the sense of struggle was, I think, primarily Lokmanya's task.

I do not think it would be unfair to the early founders of the National Congress, who were men of undeniable greatness, if I said that they rather laid the intellectual foundation for the early stages of our freedom movement, and that they were not mass leaders in the sense that some of the later leaders became. I think that the first great mass leader of this new stage of our revolutionary movement was Lokmanya Tilak. It was he who first evoked a response from the masses. After him of course came Gandhiji, who evoked an even wider response because of growing mass consciousness. Even as Lokmanya affected the younger generation, and what might broadly be called the middle class and the lower middle class, Gandhiji, coming at the next stage, affected the peasantry. Mass consciousness spread to the villages. It had reached there in Lokmanya's time, but it spread even more under Gandhiji.

So here we find a man of great learning, with wide vision and far-reaching ideas. He writes about the philosophy of the Gita, and defines it as the Philosophy of Action. He writes about the Arctic home of the Vedas. See how his mind travels

long distances. He was not a mere politician, but the necessities of the moment, the shame of living in a country that was not free, compelled this great scholar to become a statesman too and throw his weight, his energy and his ability into the struggle for freedom. It is unusual for a great scholar of that type to become a mass leader. Normally these things do not go together, but they did go together in him. This scholar of the elect became a mass leader, influenced more than one generation of our people, and influenced them not only in the sense of providing an intellectual impulse towards freedom, but by vitalizing them, making them more dynamic and making them realize that it was through organized effort and sacrifice that freedom could be obtained. In those early days there were some young men who in their spirit of anger and frustration took to the bomb or to individual acts of terrorism. Lokmanya saw that that was not the way to achieve success or strength in a country, but only the way of despair and frustration. And he raised his voice against it long before Gandhiji did so, and he directed people's minds therefore towards mass effort and mass struggle. Naturally he was a great nationalist and he thought in terms of nationalism rather than the social movements of a subsequent day. But he was not a narrow-minded nationalist. He looked ahead, and he had a vision even in those days of a united India about which he spoke and wrote. His field of battle and of achievement was not a particular corner of India, but the whole of India. And so he laboured in prison and out of prison, as many of us, humbler folk, in our much more limited spheres, laboured subsequently. It was easy for us, because we were particles of vast waves of human enthusiasm when individuals did not matter very much. We shared such physical sufferings or discomforts as we had with hundreds of thousands. It is quite absurd for anyone to condole with us for having gone to jail a couple of times, because we were exhilarated by that experience and became perhaps a little higher in stature by it. But it was an entirely different matter to be the one and only man to brave an Empire. To be a single person blazing the trail, not knowing who would follow, not knowing what would happen—that requires supreme courage which only

the greatest of people possess. Lokmanya blazed the trail in so many directions for this country, laid the foundations of our struggle and brought in for the first time a mass consciousness. He could imbue a whole people with dynamic energy because of his own unsurpassed dynamism.

There can therefore be no fitter person whose picture should adorn this Hall, which represents the achievement of freedom and independence. I do not know what other portraits subsequently will be put up in this Hall, but I can imagine no two worthier portraits than the two we have, those of Dadabhai Naoroji and Lokmanya. It was not my privilege to come into close contact with Tilak. When he was at the height of his career, I was away in a far country, still a student. But even there his voice and his story reached us and fired our imagination. We early grew up under that influence and were moulded by it. In a sense, India to the youth of that time was what had been presented by Tilak, through what he said and what he wrote, and, above all, what he suffered. That was the inheritance that Gandhiji had to start his vast movements with. If there had not been that moulding of the Indian people and India's imagination and India's youth by Lokmanya, it would not have been easy for the next step to be taken. Thus in this historical panorama we can see one great man after another coming and performing acts of destiny and history which have cumulatively led to the achievement of India's freedom. We meet here not only to unveil the picture of this great man, the Father of India's Revolution, but to remember him and to be inspired by him.

THE NAGAS

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Sir, I have welcomed this debate on the situation in the Naga Hills, not because it is grave from a military point of view, but because it is essentially the kind of problem in which this House and Parliament should take interest.

Some hon. Members have described it as a political problem and not a military problem. Well, if we had treated it as a military problem only, the results would probably have been very different. It is because we have not treated it as a purely military problem and have issued instructions, restrictions, limitations and inhibitions to our Army, that from the military point of view progress has not been as fast as it could have been. I believe that if we had treated it in a merely military way, we would not have won the goodwill and co-operation of the Nagas. I should like this House to remember that they should look at this in the larger context of our general policy in these areas, not only in the Naga Hills but in the NEFA and neighbouring areas. Many of these areas were for the first time brought under some kind of administration during the last six to eight years. This House will not probably find a parallel to the manner in which the administrative system spread out so peacefully and with such few incidents. That has been possible because we have issued strict injunctions and directions to the effect that we must win over the people and seek their co-operation. We have to build, whatever we do, on their goodwill.

There have been incidents, but very few. One major incident which the House might remember took place some three years ago. In Achaigmore, in the NEFA area, in October 1953 an officer of ours, with a number of troops, was going there, not to shoot or kill but on normal patrol and inspection work. They were suddenly and most unexpectedly attacked. The poor officer was making a cup of tea in his camp, and the others were putting up tents. Seventy persons were killed—forty porters and thirty Army personnel. Seventy

Speech in Lok Sabha, New Delhi, during debate on the Naga Hills situation, August 23, 1956

is a large number, and an occurrence of this kind naturally produces strong reactions in any government. But I doubt if any government in the world would have dealt with the situation the way we did. I must say that when we first heard of this incident, it made us and our Army rather angry. This was no battle, but sheer cold-blooded murder. However, we immediately recovered from the first shock and surprise and anger. Of course, we sent more forces there, but we told them to bear in mind that it was no good killing the hostiles and burning their villages. An hon. Member has reminded us that the normal thing in British times was to go and burn the villages, since bombing would not be effective in an area where people live in a scattered manner. But we would not do that. The place was very much in the interior and it took our forces a good deal of time and trouble to get there. Many months were needed to deal with the situation. We dealt with it essentially in a peaceful way. Ultimately we captured the people who were suspected of being guilty, and we handed them over to the tribal councils to judge.

I mention this incident of nearly three years ago to show how we approach these matters and how we issue instructions to the civilian officers and to our Army to deal with the situation in a peaceful way.

There was some trouble last year in the Tuensang area, which is largely a Naga area. It is all very well for the hon. Members Shri K. K. Basu and Shri H. V. Kamath to say that we must deal with it in a human way and not send the Army. But then, what exactly is to be done when other people start killing? Do we send them messages of goodwill, or do we try to stop the killing? The population of that area sought our help. We received appeals from the villagers and from Government employees, teachers and others, asking for protection. Was it not our duty to give them protection? That is what happened in the Tuensang area. We had to send some of our forces with rifles and we did it without fuss. It was easy enough for us to treat the situation differently. But we proceeded slowly, because we had the object of winning them over and not merely crushing them. We had of course to shoot some because they shot at us. However, the Tuensang

problem was solved within a few months without too much fuss.

When fighting was taking place in the Tuensang area, the Naga Hills were relatively quiet. There might have been some small incidents. At that time, Phizo had come to see the Governor and the Chief Minister of Assam. Actually, he issued statements more or less declaring his adherence to non-violence. But we found that while he said so and issued notices to that effect, he was actually preparing for violence. There is no doubt about it. He was inciting the people and telling them: "These statements about peaceful methods are a trick, just to give you greater chance to go ahead. Let us play this game here, and you carry on your activities there."

I want to give the hon. Members some idea of who the Nagas are. The Nagas, correctly speaking, are not what might be called a tribe or a single group of tribes closely tied to one another. I do not know when the word Naga came to be used. I have an idea that it is a British word, that is, that the word was used in the British times. I am not sure. But the tribes are named differently, Sema, Ao and Angami and so on. They do not call each other Nagas. This is a word which you and I may use and the British used. It was probably used in derision, because Naga means naked. But the biggest tribes are the Sema, Ao and Angami. If you go to this area, you will find that there is no common Naga language. The language or dialect changes every few miles, every half dozen villages.

Some tribes among the Nagas are what might be called the dominant tribes, militarily stronger or tougher than the others. The tribes which dominate the others receive some tribute from the other tribes. Some of these strong tribes, if they did not get tributes, have all along in the past taken strong action against the defaulting tribes.

Some figures about the Nagas might interest the hon. Members. I am of course using the word Naga as a generic term. The population at present all over the areas—not the Naga area alone—is a little over half a million. In the Naga Hills District, the population is a little over two lakhs. In the Tuensang Frontier Division also, the population is slightly

over two lakhs. In the Tirap Frontier Division, it is 50,000 and in Manipur State, it is 80,000. The total is a little over 500,000, which is spread out over a large area. I confess that when I heard about Nagas as such about 25 years ago, I was rather attracted by what I had heard. Then came the case of that lady to whom reference was made by Shri Kamath—Rani Guidallo—who, after suffering a long period of imprisonment, was released some years ago. I am glad to say that proper arrangements were made for her to live in the house which she built for herself and for which we gave her help. We made as much reparation as we could for the misdeeds of the previous Government.

Shri Jaipal Singh referred to the deputation of people who came to see me. Shri Phizo and a number of his colleagues met me twice here. Shri Keishing has said something about an incident at Kohima, where, according to him, the Nagas came and were prevented from giving me an address, and therefore they became angry and walked away. The facts are somewhat different. I went to Kohima. The Prime Minister of Burma had also come over, flying across the frontier. He met me at Manipur, and we were going to Burma a day or two later. I thought I might utilize that opportunity to visit Kohima. We went to Kohima and we relaxed. I suggested to the authorities there that some kind of a welcome might be given to the Burmese Prime Minister. He was our guest and the people gathered to say a few words. It was not a normal visit of mine to that place. What I found later was that Nagas there wanted to read out an address to me. The Deputy Commissioner told them: "You can hand it over to the Prime Minister afterwards; I cannot allow your reading it out to him at a meeting when the Prime Minister of Burma and others have come." It is not therefore correct to say that I refused to take the address. As a matter of fact, on a previous occasion at Kohima I had actually met the Naga leaders (Shri Phizo was not there), discussed the matter with them and taken a long document from them. That was just a year earlier, and so it is not true to say that I refused to receive an address or that the Deputy Commissioner came in the way. But he did come in the way of an address being read

at the meeting. I did not know it at that time; I knew it only later. Then, when U Nu and I arrived at the meeting place, the Nagas who were present got up and walked away. I was distressed, not on my own account, but because the Prime Minister of Burma, an honoured guest of ours, had been treated so discourteously.

Shri Basu has talked about the atrocities of the military and Shri Kamath about Cypriots and Kenyans. I do not know what justification they have for using such language. Then Shri Keishing has referred to the burning of villages and the shooting down of people. In military operations things are not done as if we were sitting in a drawing room. And I do not say that everything that was done can be justified completely. Sometimes mistakes are made. One of the most regrettable mistakes, and one which has distressed us exceedingly, has been in connection with the killing of Dr. Haralu. His sons are important officers of ours—assistant political officers—and his daughter is serving with me in the External Affairs Ministry. It came to me as a tremendous shock when I came back and heard about it, and we took immediate action in regard to it. Courts of Inquiry are carrying on investigation. Undoubtedly, we should punish those who are guilty.

I am not saying that wrong things are not being done there by individuals or groups, whether among the civil authorities or the military. But I do wish to remove the impression that our Army or anybody else there is playing fast and loose with lives, and burning villages. The General Officers Commanding and others have been constantly issuing instructions. It is true that many villages have been burnt there, but our information is that by far the greater part of the burning is done by the Naga hostiles. Shri Jaipal Singh talks about more and more regiments or battalions being sent there. But why do we send them? Principally, in order to protect the people who are being attacked. It is easy to attack in such areas. A group of ten, twenty or thirty persons can go about and attack any village. But it is very difficult to send enough people to protect every village. It is for protection that we have been sending troops to the Naga

Hills and adjoining areas. I submit that the general conduct of our forces there has been certainly better than in any similar operation that I know. I believe that Shri Keishing is misled by reports he may receive, if I may say so, from Shri Phizo's publicity department. I get them too, and they are the most fantastic tales one can imagine. They have no relation at all to truth. Sometimes they are sent abroad to foreign newspapers, in America and elsewhere.

When talking of the burnings that have taken place, we must remember, first of all, that the Naga hostiles do it deliberately. Any such group cannot subsist for long unless they get help from the villages if not out of loyalty, at least out of fear. With this threat they go about collecting money and food.

In the Tuensang Division there are at least one hundred defence societies of local people, Nagas and others, formed for the protection of villages from hostile Nagas. When the hostiles come, these local people fight them. We have given them some arms. To some extent, therefore, it becomes a civil conflict in the Naga Hills between Nagas and Nagas, and our information is that sometimes villages are burnt in this process. The figure given by Shri Keishing may be correct, but I say that most of these villages have been burnt by the Naga hostiles themselves.

There is a second reason for some of the burning that has taken place. After all these people live in huts with thatched roofs. When any kind of firing takes place between our forces and Naga forces, the firing itself sets fire to the villages. As an hon. colleague reminds me, one of the weapons the Nagas use are arrows with burning heads, which are particularly dangerous for thatched roofs. I believe that there were cases in the early days when, our Army, suspecting that some villages had been occupied by these hostiles, directly burnt them or the villages were burnt in the firing. But that kind of thing has been completely stopped, in accordance with our instructions.

I do not for a moment say that there have been no mistakes by civilians or the military. But both in our approach to this problem and, to a large extent, in the carrying out of our directions by the Army we have shown remarkable

patience in the face of considerable provocation. Any hon. Member can realize that it is very irritating to be sniped at or to be hit by an arrow or bullet suddenly while going along a road. It makes the average soldier and civilian angry. Nevertheless, our instructions are that patience must be exercised because we want to win over these people.

We are utilizing the co-operation of the Nagas in an increasing measure. There are officials who are Nagas. There are Naga people in our Assam Rifles, and some Naga regiments in our Army. Our definite instructions are that they must seek the co-operation of the Nagas in every way, but make it clear to the hostiles that a person who uses his gun against us will be met with a gun. The Army cannot be withdrawn. That would mean abandoning large numbers of people who have relied upon us for protection. We cannot leave them to be liquidated.

An hon. Member referred to the Naga National Council's agreement with Sir Akbar Hydari and Shri Bardoloi. I do not accept his statement that the agreement has not been honoured. That agreement came up before the Constituent Assembly, or rather before the Special Committee of the Constituent Assembly. All the six Schedules attached to the Constitution were largely drawn up with that agreement in view. It may be that the Sixth Schedule as a whole was not an exact reproduction of the agreement. But the whole object was to give autonomy to their areas and to help them to live according to their own ways. If it is felt that the six Schedules do not go far enough, it is open to Parliament to amend them whenever it likes.

As I said, I met Shri Phizo on three occasions and the other Naga leaders, colleagues of Shri Phizo, once or twice. I have discussed this matter with them and pointed out to them that we are always prepared to consider any constructive proposal for amendment to the provision regarding these areas, but it is no good talking to me about independence for that area. I consider it fantastic for that little corner between China and Burma and India to be called an independent State.

It is true that when they later wanted to see me, certain

conditions were attached. The first was that I was not prepared to discuss independence. The second was that they must give up violence. This was before these major acts of violence, when there were only petty acts of violence. I am, as a rule, prepared to meet anybody. But I was told that after each interview with me, these people went back and said that they were on the road to independence, because they met the Prime Minister. They go over the heads of the local Government and local officials and generally try to strengthen their position by reference to the interview they had with me. I felt that if they exploited these interviews in this manner, I should not encourage them. Even then I told them I should be glad to meet them provided they made it clear that they did not demand independence.

The Governor of Assam, as you know, is the Government of India's Agent in regard to NEFA and the problems of NEFA. He has often met the Naga leaders including Phizo. The Chief Minister too has met him more than once. This shows there has been every attempt on our part to meet them and win them over from violence. I do not maintain that every step taken by us or by the State Government has been correct. As an hon. Member said some time ago, what is called Assamization has perhaps been injudiciously pursued. But these are relatively minor things in this picture and the whole object was to deal with the Nagas directly and to establish conditions which would lead to their progress without interference.

I have been anxious that more basic schools should be established there by their own people and that there should be good work on Community Projects in that area. Many Naga boys have gone to Sabarmati to spend some years there and they have gone back as basic school teachers. Community Projects are particularly suited to the conditions in the Naga area, and they could work them with a little help from outside.

I have not referred to the military aspect. Our instructions to the military continue to be what I have just stated : that this problem must be treated as a human problem.

Some hon. Members have referred to general amnesty. Certainly there is a proclamation of amnesty. It is not as

though the moment there is a proclamation of amnesty, everybody would automatically and spontaneously surrender. Whoever wants to surrender can avail himself of the amnesty, the period of which we have been extending from time to time. We are not out to punish any individual or any group. We want them to settle down, because it is no pleasure for us to see the great majority of the people there leading abnormal lives.

Does any hon. Member expect Government to invite the leaders of the Naga National Council and treat them as the leaders of a different State and have a treaty with them? We are prepared to talk to any of them but not on the basis of independence. With that sole qualification, they are welcome, if they want to come.

There is no question of prestige. The Government of India's prestige does not arise when we are dealing with our own countrymen. The Government of India is too big for its prestige to suffer in such small ways. But we cannot take a step which will be misunderstood, misinterpreted and criticized by our own colleagues among the Nagas. Surely, the House will not expect us to betray all those Nagas who, in spite of difficulties, have co-operated with our officials and looked to us for help and protection.

An hon. Member said that the Tuensang Division and the Naga Hills District should be made into a separate political entity. I think he added the Tirap frontier tract too. These are political problems which we can very well consider. But we cannot consider them in this particular context because that will require a change in our Constitution. I have no doubt that the House will agree to change it if it is found necessary and provided the right conditions exist. In this matter, naturally, we have to consult the Assam Government. The main thing is the well-being of the people who live there. It does not matter whether you have one unit or two units. The people in those areas should have a feeling that they can lead their own lives and they should be proud of being citizens of India.

Shri Jaipal Singh has talked about dyarchy and about division of authority between the civilians and the military

there. I do not know how far the present arrangements there have come in the way of efficient work. It was our desire not to go too far militarily. That is what led us to send our Army in aid of the civil power. It was easy enough to declare martial law and hand over the whole area to the military, but we did not do so because we have always been against treating this as a purely military problem. In effect, perhaps, the civil power functions there in a very narrow way. Naturally, when armed forces function and have to deal with hostile elements, the civil power's activities are rather limited. But what Shri Jaipal Singh said is a matter worthy of consideration and we shall certainly consider it. I gather from my colleague the Home Minister that the chief function of the civil authorities there is really relief and rehabilitation. In fact, even the Army is doing that. The record of the Army and the civil authorities in regard to the building up of villages and giving relief is indeed creditable.

A proposal has been made that a parliamentary commission should be sent there. I must confess I do not quite understand what a parliamentary commission is going to do and where it will go. Wherever the commission goes, we will have to send a battalion to protect it. But I hope a time will come when hon. Members of Parliament will be able to visit those areas.

TRUE WAY TO PEACE

I AM HERE on behalf of our Government and our people to add to the many welcomes you have already received.

The meeting of this General Conference of UNESCO in Delhi has a certain special significance. It is a tribute, if I may say so, to the importance that is now attached by this great organization to the countries of Asia. But this conference

Speech at the inauguration of the tenth annual session of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), New Delhi, November 5, 1956

is significant in yet another way which was not realized when this date and venue were chosen. We meet at a moment when we can hear again the dread tramp of armed men and the thunder of bombs hurled from the skies to destroy men and cities. Because of this there is perhaps a measure of unreality about your discussing the various items on your agenda which have nothing to do with this deep crisis of the moment. But these very developments force reality upon us and mould our thinking.

Soon after the last Great War ended, and as a result of the War and the hunger for peace of the peoples of the world, the United Nations Organization came into being. The General Assembly of the United Nations came to represent the mind of the world community and its desire for peace. If the General Assembly mainly faced the political problems of the world, its specialized agencies were charged with work of equal, if not greater, importance in the economic, educational, scientific and cultural spheres.

Man does not live by politics alone, nor, indeed, wholly by economics. And so UNESCO came into being to represent something that was vital to human existence and progress. Even as the United Nations General Assembly represented the political will of the world community, UNESCO tried to represent the finer and the deeper sides of human life and, indeed, might be said to represent the conscience of the world community.

I should like to remind you of the preamble to the constitution of this great organization. This embodies a declaration on behalf of the governments of the States and their peoples and lays down that "since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed; that ignorance of each other's ways and lives has been a common cause throughout the history of mankind of that suspicion and mistrust between peoples of the world through which their differences have all too often broken into war; that the great and terrible war which is now ended was a war made possible by the denial of the democratic principles of the dignity, equality, and mutual respect of men and by the propagation in their place, through

ignorance and prejudice, of the doctrine of the inequality of men and races; that the wide diffusion of culture and the education of humanity for justice and liberty and peace are indispensable to the dignity of men and constituted a sacred duty which all the nations must fulfil in a spirit of mutual assistance and concern; that a peace based exclusively upon the political and economic arrangements of governments would not be a peace which would secure the unanimous, lasting and sincere support of the peoples of the world and that the peace must, therefore, be founded, if it is not to fail, upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind." Here is laid down in clear and noble language the basic approach of this organization and the way it has to travel if it has to realize its objectives of international peace and the common welfare of mankind.

UNESCO has considerable achievements to its credit during its ten years of existence. And yet after these ten years what do we find? Violence and hatred still dominate the world. The doctrine of inequality of men and races is preached and practised. The democratic principles of dignity, equality and mutual respect are denied or ignored. Some countries dominate over others and hold their people in subjection, denying them freedom and the right to grow, and armed might is used to suppress the freedom of countries.

UNESCO does not concern itself with political questions and it would not be right for us to raise them in this gathering. But UNESCO is intimately concerned with the dignity of man and the vital importance of freedom.

We see today in Egypt, as well as in Hungary, both human dignity and freedom outraged and the force of modern arms used to suppress peoples and to gain political objectives; old colonial methods which we had thought in our ignorance belonged to a more unenlightened age are revived and practised; in other parts of the world also movements for freedom are crushed by superior might. It is true that the atomic and hydrogen bombs have not thus far been used. But who can confidently say that they will not be used?

The preamble of the UNESCO constitution says, as I have quoted, that wars begin in the minds of men. We have

been living through a period of cold war which has now broken out into open and violent war. Can we be surprised at its inevitable result?

You will forgive me, I hope, if I speak with some feeling. I would be untrue to myself and to this distinguished gathering if I did not refer to something which has moved us deeply and which must be in the minds of all of us here. We use brave phrases to impress ourselves and others, but our actions belie those noble sentiments, and so we live in a world of unreality where profession has little to do with practice. When that practice imperils the entire future of the world then it is time we came back to reality in our thinking and in our action.

At present it would appear that great countries think that the only reality is force and violence and that fine phrases are merely the apparatus of diplomacy. This is a matter which concerns all of us, whichever quarter of the world we may live in. But, in a sense, it concerns us in Asia and Africa more than in other countries because some of our countries have recently emerged into freedom and independence and we cherish them with all our strength and passion. We are devoting ourselves to serving our people and to bettering their lives and making them grow in freedom and progress. We have bitter memories of the past when we were prevented from so growing and we can never permit a return to that past age. And yet we find an attempt made to reverse the current of history and of human development. We find that all our efforts at progress might well be set at nought by the ambitions and conflicts of other peoples. Are we not to feel deeply when our life's work is imperilled and our hopes and dreams shattered?

Many of the countries in Asia laid down a set of Five Principles, which we call Panchsheel, for the governance of international relations and for the peaceful coexistence of nations, without interference with each other, so that each nation and people might grow according to its own genius and in co-operation with others. These Five Principles are in full conformity with the noble ideals of the UNESCO constitution. We see now that these Five Principles are also words

without meaning to some countries who claim the right of deciding problems by superior might.

I have called this great assembly the conscience of the world community. The problems we have to face, many and complicated as they are, will never be solved except on the basis of good morals and conscience. It is for this reason that I beg of you, distinguished delegates from the nations of the world, to pay heed to this collapse of conscience and good morals that we see around us, for unless we do so all our fine ideals and the good work you have done will be shattered into nothingness.

May I also venture to point out to you that a world organization like this cannot be properly constituted or function adequately if a large section of the world remains unrepresented here? I hope that three countries which have recently attained their independence—the Sudan, Tunisia and Morocco—will find a place soon in this organization to share the burdens and responsibilities of its labours. But I would especially refer to the People's Government of China and the six hundred million people who live in that great country who have so far not been represented here.

The countries of Europe and America are fortunate in some ways for they have attained a measure of well-being. We in Asia and Africa still lack the primary necessities of life. To obtain these becomes, therefore, our first task and we cannot do so with war and violence. I earnestly trust that the meeting of this organization in this ancient city of Delhi will turn your minds more to the needs of these under-developed countries of the world, which hunger for bread and education and health, but which, above all, cherish freedom and will not part with it at any price.

Our country is a large one and our population is considerable. But we have no desire to interfere with any other country. We have no hatreds and we have been nurtured under the inspiring guidance of our great leader, Mahatma Gandhi, in the ways of peace. We want to be friends with all the world. We know our failings and seek to overcome them, so that we might be of service to our own people and to the world.

I have spoken to you out of my heart, and I have done so in all humility, for I know that we have men and women of wisdom and long experience here and it is not for me to tell you what you should do and what you should not do. But since it is one of the objectives of UNESCO to have a free exchange of ideas in the unrestricted pursuit of objective truth, I have ventured to place before you some of the thoughts I have in mind.

I welcome you again, distinguished delegates, and I earnestly trust that your labours will take you and the world some way towards the realization of the ideals which you have enshrined in your constitution.

APSARA

BOTH THE GOVERNOR and Dr. Bhabha have expressed their thanks to the representatives of various countries and their atomic energy establishments who have come here from long distances. I should like to convey to them my own feelings of gratitude. Some of them will no doubt find this a 'small fry' affair because they are used to things much bigger. But I have no doubt they will appreciate that in the conditions which exist in India, and in Asia, the work that has been done here has some significance.

We are told, and I am prepared to believe it on Dr. Bhabha's word, that this is the first atomic energy reactor in Asia except, possibly, the Soviet areas. In that sense, this represents a certain historic moment in India and in Asia. Though today's is only a formal inauguration ceremony of something which really has been working for some time, it is also a recognition of what is likely to take place in the future.

We in India and, in a greater or lesser degree, in other countries in Asia, are involved in raising the standard of living of our people. Some people may think that the deve-

Speech at the inauguration of the Swimming Pool Reactor at Trombay, January 20, 1957.

lopment of atomic energy is not directly related to the question of economic improvement. But we must remember that few things that we do produce results immediately. Dr. Bhabha has given you some figures showing how important it is for India to develop atomic energy. Just as the industrial revolution went ahead whether people liked it or not, so this atomic revolution has something inevitable about it. Either you go ahead with it, or others go ahead and you fall behind and drag yourself in their trail.

As I stand here, I have this Swimming Pool Reactor behind me, and the island of Elephanta in front of me, not far away. For 1,300 years now, Elephanta has continued to present a great aspect of our history. People go to see it, even the distinguished scientists who have come here for this function, because Elephanta presumably represents something of lasting value and significance. Thirteen hundred years lie between the sculpture in the island of Elephanta and this Swimming Pool Reactor which represents the middle of the twentieth century. Both, I take it, have their place, and any person who ignores either of them misses an important element of life. I don't suppose humanity can live on reactors alone. Certainly it cannot live on Elephanta alone. In a sense, it is the combination of Elephanta and the Swimming Pool Reactor—odd as it may seem—that might produce a proper balance in life.

In the old days men of religion talked about the mysteries. In Greece, the high priests who reputedly knew about these mysteries exercised a great amount of influence on the common people who did not understand them. That was so in every country. We now have these mysteries which the high priests of science flourish before us, not only flourish but threaten us with. They make us feel full of wonder and full of fear. These new mysteries of science, and of higher mathematics, unveil various aspects of the physical world to us. No one knows where this will lead us. Some of us may feel frightened, but in the ultimate, we should never be frightened of the truth. We cannot suppress truth; we cannot suppress the desire of man to unravel, to discover, to progress, even though it may land him in dangerous situations. If the human

mind by chance takes the wrong turn, well, it suffers the consequences. Therefore, it is no good trying to stop this quest. It cannot be stopped. But it can be and has to be organized in such a way as to bring good to the world instead of evil. I believe people in every country of the world, and more especially those countries which are advanced in atomic energy development, realize this. Even though they possess this fearsome power, which is ever growing, they also realize the dangers of using it in the wrong way. I imagine that everybody now realizes that with things as they are today, a global war in which strategic use of atomic weapons is made is out of question. Some people dally with the idea of what is called tactical use of these weapons, as distinct from strategic use. With the little I know about these matters, it seems to me dangerous to play about with atomic weapons in this way. Any use of it must be forbidden because it will bring disaster to everybody. Hence the importance of the talks that go on from time to time for controlling the use of nuclear weapons. When you think of controlling the use of this power, you have to think in terms of disarmament. This is not the occasion for me to talk about this complicated subject. But I believe that in spite of apparent and real difficulties, people's minds and the minds of those who control the destinies of nations, are beginning more and more to take what I may venture to call a realistic view of the situation. Let us hope that they will arrive at some decision which will put an end to the terrible fear that these weapons might be used. Indeed, this itself will be helpful in controlling the use of any weapons of large-scale destruction.

So far as India's development of atomic energy is concerned, we are at the beginning of the journey, although, I believe, we have done rather well in the last few years. I should like to congratulate those responsible, Dr. Bhabha, Dr. Krishnan and all the young men and women of the Atomic Energy Department, who are doing such good work. It is really when I talk to them and see their trained minds and informed enthusiasm that I realize what very good material we have. The future becomes much more assured not because of these cement-and-steel buildings we put up,

but because of the human material we have. I should therefore like specially to congratulate these people on the work they have done. What you see here is the result of their work.

We are not reluctant in the slightest degree to take advice and help from other countries. We are grateful to them for the help which they have given—and which we hope to get in future—because of their longer experience. But it is to be remembered that this Swimming Pool Reactor in front of you is the work, almost entirely, of our young Indian scientists and builders. Having said that I should like, as Dr. Bhabha has done, to express my gratitude to the countries which have been generously helping us. We have received help from many of them. Presently you will see what is called the Canada-India Reactor which is being built with the generous help of the Canadian Government. You have learnt of the continuous help we have had from the atomic energy establishments of the United Kingdom and the United States, and of the co-operation we have had from France. There has been co-operation with the Soviet Union also in this matter, and it will no doubt develop in future.

We have built these atomic energy establishments here not only to help ourselves, but as a centre where we can share such knowledge and experience as we possess, and as these establishments might offer, with people of other countries of Asia or Africa. I believe some of them have expressed their willingness to take advantage of them. I should like to repeat that we shall gladly welcome the association in these training facilities, of people from countries which do not possess them, more especially in Asia and parts of Africa.

I am happy today, but with that happiness it is impossible not to think of the likelihood of this development taking a malevolent turn. No man can prophesy the future. But I should like to say on behalf of my Government—and I think I can say with some assurance, on behalf of any future Government of India—that whatever might happen, whatever the circumstances, we shall never use this atomic energy for evil purposes. There is no condition attached to this assurance, because once a condition is attached, the value of such an assurance does not go very far.

As I formally declare open this atomic energy establishment, I wish to say one thing more. It has been suggested that we should give a suitable name to the Swimming Pool Reactor. In the course of the afternoon, while we were having tea, this subject was discussed. Dr. Krishnan, from the fund of his Sanskrit lore, suggested various names. Dr. Bhabha pondered over them, and the Governor, who is a Sanskrit scholar, was consulted, and we thought of a name for this Swimming Pool Reactor. It may be that when you hear the name that we are suggesting, you will be somewhat surprised. But on further thought you will see how very appropriate it is. The name we suggest for it is Apsara which, you all know, means a celestial damsel or water nymph. This is a Swimming Pool Reactor and an *apsara* is specially associated with water. The name is therefore appropriate. So, with your approval, I name this Swimming Pool Reactor Apsara.

EFFECTIVE INTERNATIONAL LAW

I DO NOT KNOW VERY MUCH about international law but every person who has to dabble in public affairs inevitably comes up against it and has to take the advice of experts. I have a vague recollection that, connected with this idea of international law, there were, at various times in the history of Europe, concepts like the holy alliance—a certain number of countries binding themselves together for various reasons, against other countries or other forces which did not go along with their thinking. That of course is contrary to the very concept of internationalism. Today we see certain tendencies of the revival of holy alliances. They are not called by that name, but certain groups of nations function more or less on the basis of the holy alliance idea. They consider themselves the centre of the world and expect other countries to fall in line. This may have some justification, but it does put these

Speech at the Asian Legal Consultative Committee meeting, New Delhi, April 18, 1957

other countries in an embarrassing position. Either one joins the holy alliance or one is outside the pale of international law, in a sense. The emergence of Asian and African countries as independent nations and this return to the holy alliance idea make it important that concepts of international law should be examined closely.

Let us take the United Nations. I think it was supposed to be an international organization inclusive of all the independent nations of the world. There is a tendency, however, to regard it as something less than that—a tendency, which, I suppose, emanates from the holy alliance idea. This in turn has affected other problems also. Politicians and statesmen who discuss such problems are naturally influenced by their political approach, and so we do not get what might be called a scholarly, objective estimate. Further, it so happens, that what we generally get is the non-Asian or non-African side. I respect that side, but it is possible that the scholars of that persuasion might not bear in mind some aspects which would be obvious to Asian scholars and jurists. Therefore, it is desirable that the various aspects of international law should be considered objectively and in a scholarly manner by the eminent lawyers and jurists of Asia and Africa.

Nowadays many words and phrases are used the dictionary meaning and significance of which have changed completely in the hands of politicians, that is, people of my tribe. We used to know, for example, what 'belligerency' was. Belligerency, I believe, is defined as waging a regular and recognized war. It must be regular and it must be recognized; otherwise, I suppose, it is guerilla fighting, which is not belligerency. And in so far as States or rulers are concerned, the opposite of belligerency used to be neutrality, that is, not siding with a power which is belligerent or which is waging an active and recognized war. Yet, delegates here must know how vaguely the word 'neutrality', or 'neutralism', as it is sometimes called, is used now—sometimes as a term of abuse, sometimes in a different way, but mostly in a manner which does not describe what is meant exactly. As I understand the terms, belligerency and neutrality, in relation to

Powers, refer to a state of war or to countries not joining a war. But as everyone knows, these words are used even when there is no active war. If a country is supposed to be neutral today, then presumably some other country which is not neutral should be described as belligerent. And yet that would be a wrong description, because the other country is not engaged in regular or recognized warfare. I do not quite know how international law or jurists of repute would define what is called cold war, which is presumably some kind of suspended belligerency.

All these developments create problems for politicians and statesmen. I do not suppose that juristic definitions solve such problems. Nevertheless, they might clear the air a little and I hope that an eminent body of scholars and jurists will throw light on these terms so that at least our thinking may become straight.

As I said, we find today a return, to some extent, to the idea of the old holy alliance, backed by military pacts and economic measures. I should say that there is more than one holy alliance. Behind all this lies enormous danger to the world in case of war. I take it that international law is meant primarily to prevent war. Its purpose is to settle problems and disputes by methods other than war. War is an absence of law. It is true that so far international law does not have behind it the same strength that domestic law does. But its main purpose is the avoidance of war. Almost everybody in the wide world dislikes the idea of war today because it is so dangerous. How can jurists and lawyers help in the avoidance of war? They cannot, I suppose, help directly in political developments but they can at least help in clear thinking. Such clarity is needed because the concept of new holy alliances to which I referred, and the concept of cold war and the peculiar interpretation given to neutrality, confuse our thinking and our actions. I hope you will help us by analysing these concepts so that we may not be led away by the slogans of politicians and statesmen. Do not think I am going to decry my tribe of politicians and statesmen here. They have much virtue in them. And I am not going to say that jurists and lawyers are always very successful in dealing

with public affairs, although they may be successful in dealing with matters in courts, or in giving opinions. A French writer on statecraft who lived some considerable time ago, said, discussing lawyers, that in general the training of a lawyer breeds habits and dispositions of the mind which are not favourable to the practice of diplomacy. Whether that is entirely true or not I do not know, but there is perhaps something in it. The politicians obviously often go wrong, but the lawyers and the jurists in their ivory towers can also lose touch with reality. Therefore, some of the greatest judges have been those who have not only interpreted the law but adapted it to changing conditions without doing violence to it. It would be absurd for a problem belonging to the middle of the twentieth century to be considered by some text-book maxim of the eighteenth or the nineteenth century.

There is another aspect to this, which troubles many of us—how far some recent developments can be fitted in with any conception of international law or moral law. Those developments which threaten the very existence of the human race, not only by mass killing, but by poisoning the atmosphere so that it has terrible genetic consequences, are not justifiable by any conception of international law or moral law. Surely this is not a matter to be considered only by statesmen and politicians. I do not know if jurists consider the moral law, but I suppose they have it in mind even in considering the letter of the law. It may be desirable for them to consider whether and how far these preparations for nuclear warfare or the test explosions are in keeping with any conception of international or moral law. If the politician, as a man who has some responsibility in public affairs, expresses his opinion, it is usually considered a biased and coloured opinion because he belongs to the political apparatus of a country. But if jurists and others who are in the habit of considering problems calmly and objectively gave their opinion, it would carry much more weight, just as the opinion of scientists who are presumed to think of matters objectively and in a scientific temper, carries weight.

International law is affected by the world becoming something bigger than the old narrow European community,

And as the Attorney-General said, modern developments in science and the application of science in communications and in social structures, affect our ways of life, international relationships as well as individual and group relations, and hence the need for a new concept of international law.

You have referred, Mr. Attorney-General, to Panchsheel, the Five Principles which have been accepted by a number of countries of Asia and some countries outside Asia. I claim no special virtue for them. They are only some simple principles which, if adopted by nations in regard to international relationships, will not only lead us away from war but will establish healthy relationships. They are really simple and I do not see how anyone anywhere can object to any of them—the recognition of sovereignty, non-aggression, non-interference in internal affairs. When a country does not conform to these principles it is misbehaving, interfering. It is not acting according to the real basis of international law, which consists of non-aggression, non-interference, recognition of sovereignty, mutual respect, all these leading up to peaceful co-existence. Peaceful coexistence means coexistence of countries which differ in their policies. There is no point in saying that two persons or two countries who agree should exist peacefully. They do. There is no point in my saying that I should be tolerant towards my neighbour if he and I have no reason to differ. The question of my tolerating my neighbour, and his tolerating me, arises only when we differ. The question of peaceful coexistence therefore comes in only when countries differ in their policies, provided always that they do not interfere with each other, either internally or externally. If they do, then that is a breach. Therefore, I submit that these Five Principles which are sometimes called Panchsheel, are a healthy basis for international relations, and I would further say in all humility that there is no other basis unless you accept the basis which leads to conflict, which of course is not our objective. Surely international law should not encourage any attempt to compel or coerce a country to do something against its will, or to fall in line with something that will bring conflicts.

There is great variety in this world. Are we going to

produce uniformity through some measure of force, military or economic? Perhaps it would be a good thing if there were uniformity in basic principles. But that can only develop by argument, by reason, by discussion, by conversion. If uniformity should come about through war, then we shall land ourselves in a dread state which I am convinced will not lead to the solution of any problems.

I have ventured, distinguished delegates, just to place some layman's ideas before you. They are not of academic interest, but they are of an urgency which compels the attention of every thinking person. And I am sure they occupy your minds too. I cannot suggest that you should find remedies for the world's ills but I do hope that you will show us some way of clear thinking which will lead to right action.

OUR ATOMIC ENERGY RESOURCES

MR. SPEAKER, SIR, in the course of this discussion, almost everyone has emphasized the necessity for going ahead as far as we can in the development of atomic energy in this country. The subject is naturally one which excites the imagination of everyone, and there is a feeling that in this matter at least we should not lag behind, as we did when the Industrial Revolution took place. I can say nothing more about it than that we have no intention of lagging behind, in so far as our resources permit.

Apart from the theoretical and practical necessity of keeping abreast of this new realm of knowledge and discovery, from the power point of view also it is likely to be of the utmost importance for us in India to utilize atomic power for peaceful purposes. We hear a lot about the use of coal and oil for purposes of power. But it is a rather sobering thought that if we use our power supplies, let us say, at the rate at

Reply to debate on demands of the Atomic Energy Department,
Lok Sabha, July 24, 1957

which the United States is using them, they will disappear in a very short time.

We now hope to have more oil than we thought at first, and I believe that we are likely to discover oil in several parts of India. The fact remains, however, that our power potential, considering our population, is not great. Our problem is not limited only to the present generation : we have also to build for the future.

As far as one can see, the main source of power, apart from the conventional sources, has to be atomic energy. It is therefore a question of extreme practical importance for us to develop power from atomic sources.

It is curious that only about three or four years ago, people talked rather vaguely about using atomic energy for power purposes. Hardly any country had definite plans. The progress since then has been so rapid in some of these countries, that atomic power is now taken for granted. Formerly the thought that it could be used for civil purposes was a kind of mental adventure. Now it is recognized that it is an economic proposition.

If you are near the source of power, that is, coal or some hydro-electric concern, you would not put an atomic energy plant there. But take a place like Delhi. You have to bring coal from nearly a thousand miles away. Then there is the question of transport and also of cost. It might well be cheaper to have an atomic energy plant here.

I would like to make three points. The first is that India must have some additional sources of power, apart from the conventional sources, if it is to progress and ensure higher standards of living for the people. The second is that it is possible to do it through the proper development of atomic energy now. The third point is that we must try to do it. Indeed, we are trying to do it.

Many hon. Members have congratulated the Atomic Energy Department on the work that it has done. Some have criticized it and said that it ought to do much more. It is not very easy to have a correct measurement of what one can do and what one could have done if one had proceeded differently. But the fact remains that the development of

atomic energy work in India has been remarkably rapid and good. The Atomic Energy Department as such was started only three years ago, in 1954, although the Atomic Energy Commission was there earlier.

In August 1954, I think we spent about a crore of rupees on atomic energy work here. Two years later, that is, in the current year, we are spending twelve times that amount. Money is not much of a test, but still it sometimes helps us to judge how much we are doing.

I may inform the House that nobody in the Government of India, anxious as we are to economize and save money, has ever refused any urgent demand of the Department or come in the way of its development for financial reasons. Naturally, there are certain limits beyond which we cannot go. But we realize completely the importance of this work in the present and in the future. This is really why it is usual in India and in some other countries for the Prime Minister to be in charge of it. Not that the Prime Minister of India or any other Prime Minister is supposed to be peculiarly brilliant or especially suited for that purpose. The Prime Minister's being in charge merely shows how much importance has been given to work on atomic energy.

There are two sides to atomic energy work: research and practical application of that research. So far as research is concerned, the Tata Institute is our principal institute. I entirely agree with the hon. Member who said that this kind of work should be encouraged in the universities, although I would add that what is necessary in the universities is a sound grounding. In various sciences, specially atomic physics, there is sometimes a tendency to try to do higher research work without an adequate grounding. That is why we must have a broad foundation in the universities from where specialists will go out. As you will have seen from the printed paper that has been circulated, we have increased the number of people being trained by the Atomic Energy Department. I believe the present number is about two hundred and sixty and it will go up to about a thousand very soon. This training is not simple training but highly specialized training of very able men especially selected for the purpose. I think that the

work we have done in the realm of theory and research as well as practice has been appreciated in various centres of atomic energy work in the world.

Whenever I travel abroad, I am asked by scientists of the countries I visit about our work, and I am told by them how much they appreciate the rapid progress we have made. Only about a month or six weeks ago, I happened to meet more than once a person who is almost the father of all this business, Prof. Niels Bohr. In the field of atomic physics, he is a kind of demigod or big *guru*. He himself has not visited India, but he keeps himself informed of our progress. He spoke to me in the highest terms about what we were doing. He sought to make out that in his country they were trying to do something which we had already done. I wanted to say this because some very fine young men are doing this work, not only two or three top men.

Shri Tyabji asked why some Indians who are abroad did not come and work in India. I can give him no particular answer. I myself should like to see our noted scientists come and work in India and help us in developing various important activities. So far as scientists are concerned we have definitely tried to get them here. Shri Tyabji mentioned two names, Shri Gupta and Shri Chandrasekhar. I might inform him that in the course of the past few years we have made numerous attempts to get these gentlemen, as well as others, to come and work here. On several occasions they had agreed to come, but later refused. In the totality of circumstances they prefer to remain outside. It is a little difficult for us to compel anyone to come. Conditions in India in the past perhaps did not give Indian scientists enough opportunity to develop their talent or genius here, and I can understand their going abroad when they got the opportunity. That can no longer be said to be the situation, though we cannot in the near future compete with countries like the United States in salaries or other amenities, although we recognize that scientists and other people of that type should be paid adequately.

Shri Tyabji asked how many research papers have been contributed. Well, I cannot give him the exact number. But

the fact is that a considerable number of papers indicating research done have come out of the Tata Institute. Obviously one does not judge an institute or any individual by the quantity of work done but by its quality. A person may write a hundred papers and they may be second-rate or third-rate. Another may write ten and they may be first-rate.

The putting up of the swimming pool reactor which was opened by me formally in January—and to which we gave the appropriate name of Apsara—was done entirely by Indian scientists and Indian engineers and that was a good piece of work. Now two other reactors are being built of which the Canada-India reactor is one.

In our research work at the Tata Institute, I believe, at least one new elementary particle has been discovered and at least one new decay process for an elementary particle. The Institute of Fundamental Research is recognized the world over as one of the leading research institutes in mathematics and physics.

The Atomic Energy Department is planning for the next fifteen years ahead. There is uranium in India, though not in very large quantities. We have vast quantities of thorium. Thorium is of great importance and can be used for working reactors, but only in the second stage. In order to reach the second stage, we have to go through the first stage with uranium reactors. It has become necessary, therefore, to start with these natural uranium reactors so that later we may get to the next stage of thorium which we have in fair abundance, not only in Kerala, as we all know, but in Bihar in even greater quantities.

There is one aspect of this subject which I should like to mention because it has some political bearing. It is very necessary for us not to depend too much on outside sources. If we depend too much on others for fissionable material, then, inevitably, that dependence may affect us in the sense that other people may try to affect our foreign policy or any other policy through that dependence. That is why, when discussions took place about the formation of what is called the International Agency for the Development of Atomic Energy for Peaceful Purposes, we had this specially in mind. If we

have to depend too much on some central pool which contains very special fissionable materials like Uranium 235 and Plutonium 233 then we shall have to submit to all kinds of conditions. These very things are necessary to make atom bombs. We have declared quite clearly that we are not interested in making atom bombs, even if we have the capacity to do so, and that in no event will we use atomic energy for destructive purposes. I am quite sure that when I say this, I represent every Member of this House. I hope that will be the policy of all future Governments. The fact remains that if one has these fissionable materials and if one has the resources, then one can make a bomb, unless the world will be wise enough to come to some decision to stop the production of such bombs.

INDEX

A

Abdullah, Sheikh, 212, 213
 Accra, 340
 Aden, 296
 Adult Franchise, 60, 138, 287
 Afghans, 33
 Africa, 22, 99, 255, 273, 285, 286, 288, 289, 291, 292, 297, 300, 329, 340, 341, 342, 388, 502, 503, 507, 509
 African Students' Association, Delhi, 340
 Alcoholic drinks, 460
 Algeria, 296
 Ali, Chaudhuri Mohammad, 354, 355, 356
 All India Congress Committee, 51
 All India Manufacturer's Organization, 83
 All-India Newspaper Editors' Conference
 New Delhi, 454
 Allahabad, 196, 204, 483, 484
 America, *see* United States
 —American Constitution, 128
 —American Revolution, 50, 137
 Andhra, 179, 204, 207, 208
 Appleby, Paul, 105, 145, 146
 —Appleby Report, 145-151
 Apsara, 504-508, 517
 Arabic (language), 28
 Arabs, 378, 484
 Archaeological monuments, 33, 469
 Architecture, 400, 401, 417, 465-6, 471
 Armaments, 427
 Aryan Civilization, 32, 33
 Aryans, 413, 415
 Asia, 9, 22, 40, 44, 48, 67, 99, 144, 250, 251, 253, 255, 263, 265, 267, 278, 283 to 286, 288 to 294, 297, 300, 329, 345, 346, 358, 469, 499, 502-504, 507, 509, 512
 Asian-African Conference, *see* Bandung Conference
 Asian Legal Consultative Committee, 508
 Asoka, 33, 187, 434
 —Edicts of, 177, 449, 450
 Assam Government, 498
 Assam Rifles, 496
 Associated Chambers of Commerce,
 Calcutta, 56
 Astrology, 118
 Ataturk, Kemal, 152

Atomic energy, 41, 58, 59, 106, 133, 139, 166, 184, 254-257, 295, 424, 504-508 513-518
 —Weapons, 39, 78, 178, 184, 254, 281 282, 362, 363, 408, 506
 —International Control, 254-262
 —Atomic Age, 24, 49 281, 282, 416, 418
 —Indian Resources, 513 to 518
 Atomic Energy Department, India, 260, 506, 513-517
 Australia 66, 266, 291, 300
Autobiography, 474
 Ayurved, 481-485
 Azad, Maulana, 212, 400
 Azad Kashmir, 232, 238

B

Backward Classes Commission, 459
 Baghdad Pact, 223, 235, 312, 319-320, 328, 329, 331, 338, 363, 364
 Banaras, 420, 452, 471
 Bandung Conference, 285, 286, 288-291, 292-301, 303
 Bandung Declaration, 297, 298
 Bangalore, 27, 465-7
 Banihal tunnel, 216
 Bardoloi, Gopinath, 496
 Basic Education, 402-406, 459
 Basu, K. K., 491, 494
 Belgium, 74
 Belligerency, 509-510
 Belvalkar, S. K., 421
 Bengal, *see* West Bengal
 Bengal & S.R.C. Report, 191, 192, 194
 Bengali (language), 398
 Berlin, 249
 Bhabha, H. J., 504-08
 Bhakra-Nangal, 1-4, 73, 121, 182, 353, 458
 Bhakra-Nangal and Pakistan, 346, 347, 352, 353
 Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute,
 Poona, 418, 419, 421
 Bhilai, 148
 Bihar, 121, 180, 277, 517
 Bihar & S.R.C. Report, 191, 192, 194
 Blount, K., 164, 165
 Bodhidharma, 417
 Bogor, 292-94

Bohr, Niels, 516
 Bombaine, 378, 379
 Bombay, 83
 Bombay City & S.R.C. Report, 185, 186, 201, 228
 Bombay Corporation, 176
 Bombay State & S.R.C. Report, 178-80, 185, 186, 193-95, 198-200, 202, 205, 207
 Books, Influence of, 410
 Bose, S. N., 438
 Brahmaputra, 3
 Britain, 478
 —British Constitution, 128
 —British Empire, 369, 462
 —British Government, 314, 461, 462
 —British Nationality Act, 312
 —British Parliament, 113, 140, 142, 149, 150, 156
 —British Rule, 33, 154, 274, 478
 Budapest, 324, 327, 335, 336, 340
 Buddha and Buddhism, 33, 47, 187, 415, 417, 420, 429-433, 471
 Buddha, Mahaparinirvana, 429, 431
 Buddhists, 234
 Bulganin, Nikolai, 308, 329
 Bulganin & Khrushchev, Welcome speech to, 308-11
 Bureaucracy, 148, 149, 159, 160, 162
 Burma, 72, 271, 273, 283, 286, 288, 290, 292, 303, 312, 313, 316, 493, 496

C

Cabinet, 199, 200, 206, 207, 208
 Cairo, 328
 Cambodia, 282, 283, 299
 Canada, 507
 Canada-India Reactor, 507, 517
 Cape Comorin, 65, 204
 Capitalism, 52, 78, 81, 82
 Caste system, 33, 37, 86, 204, 244, 415, 417, 424, 440, 453
 Casteism, 35, 37, 54, 154, 455
 Castile, 378
 Central Asia, 33
 Central Board of Irrigation & Power, 116
 Ceylon, 239, 251, 253, 286, 292, 316
 —Indian Nationals, 366, 367, 369, 370, 371
 —People of Indian descent, 365-71
 Chakravartty, Renu, 125, 313
 Charles II, 378
 Chatterjee, N. C., 125, 127, 128, 130, 191, 313, 392, 447, 448

Children's education, 403
 China, 3, 9, 12, 17, 40, 53, 76, 82, 94, 136, 165, 239, 253, 262-64, 271, 273-79, 282, 299, 303, 390, 417, 423, 469, 496, 503
 —Non-inclusion in U.N., 241, 242, 270, 271, 305, 503
 —History, 273 to 275
 —Chinese in South-East Asia, 271-73
 —Chinese language, 28, 422
 —Chinese Revolution, 137
 —Long March, 275
 Chittaranjan factory, 11, 353
 Chou En-lai, 272, 299, 300, 367
 Citizenship Bill, 311
 Coal, 80, 257, 258, 259, 513, 514
 Cold war, 45, 92, 310, 363, 502, 510
 Colombo, 251, 379
 Colonialism, 48, 49, 253, 269, 295, 296, 389
 Cominform, 273
 Comintern, 273
 Commonwealth, 312, 317
 —Commonwealth Citizenship, 311-18
 —Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference, 314
 Communalism, 35, 37, 135, 154, 455
 Communications, 59, 60, 468, 469
 Communism, 17, 70, 76, 77, 136, 264, 265, 272, 275, 277, 285, 332
 Communist Party of India, 134, 135-37, 152
 Community Projects, 10, 21, 22, 23, 25, 34, 72, 83, 100, 101, 497
 Congress, *see* Indian National Congress
 Constitution of India, 27, 30, 46, 53, 113-15, 128, 129, 172, 173, 174, 201, 203, 205, 208, 224, 227, 284, 314, 454, 455, 496, 498
 —Constituent Assembly, 496
 —Amending Bill, 124-34
 —Directive Principles of Policy, 455
 "Controlled Democracy", 360
 Co-operative Farming, 82, 89
 Co-operatives, 72, 79, 82, 89, 109, 136
 Corruption, 163
 Cottage Industry, 19, 20, 79, 86, 89, 101
 "Crisis in Civilization", 436
 Cromwell, 433, 434
 Currency and Finance, 19
 Czechoslovakia, 328

D

Daman, 384
 Damascus, 471

Damodar, 353
 Damodar Valley, 2, 64, 121
 Defence, 38-44, 88, 103
 Defence Services, 19
 Deficit Finance, 19
 Delhi, 29, 46, 167, 215, 220, 464, 467, 471
 Democracy, 6, 8, 30-31, 35, 46, 50, 53-54,
 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 65, 70, 79, 81-82, 111,
 129, 137-40, 148, 152, 156, 158-63, 178,
 188, 201, 252, 287, 302, 303, 359, 360,
 450, 451, 464, 481
 Democratic Centralism, 278
 Deshmukh, C. D., 199, 206 to 208
 Deshpande, V. G., 390
 Deva, Narendra, 190
 Development Commissioners' Conference,
 Simla, 21
 Devika Rani, 407
Dhammapada, 7
 Dictatorship, 11, 152
 'Dinkar', Ramdhari Sinha, 412, 413, 418
 Disarmament, 248, 250, 304, 320, 329,
 332, 506
Discovery of India, 472, 474
 Displaced Persons, 87
 Diu, 384
 Divorce, *See* Marriage and Divorce
 Dravidian Civilization, 32, 33, 413, 414

E

East Africa, 397
 East Bengal Exodus, 354, 355, 356-357,
 365
 East Punjab, 167, 346-48, 352
 Eastern Europe, 51
 Economic Democracy, 60, 287
 Egypt, 49, 321-334, 335, 501
 —, United Nations Force and India, 323,
 324
 Einstein, Albert, 119, 247, 254, 476
 Eisenhower, 255, 257, 260
 Eisenhower Doctrine, 342, 343
 Election Commission, 152
 Elections, 46, 47, 53, 54, 152, 153, 227
 Elephanta, 505
 Employment and unemployment, 2, 9, 12
 to 16, 28, 24, 52, 57, 58, 69, 71, 74, 81,
 87, 97, 98, 107, 133, 459
 Ends and Means, 202, 310, 388, 462
 Engineers, Role of, 107, 116-20, 122, 124,
 147, 149, 165, 475
 England, 16, 17, 59, 60, 72, 74, 77, 78, 138,
 142, 151, 164, 262, 274, 379, 449, 479

—Industrial Advancement of, 357
 English (language), 27 to 29, 422-426
 Europe, 60, 84, 85, 139, 145, 196, 276, 277,
 281, 284, 290, 291, 337, 338, 381, 460,
 503, 508

F

Far East, 270, 271, 299, 305, 388
 Far Eastern Political Conference, 240-244
 Federation of Indian Chambers of Com-
 merce & Industry, New Delhi, 54
 Films, Influence of, 410, 411
 —Film Censorship, 408, 409, 411
 —Film Industry, 407, 411, 412
 —Film Seminar, New Delhi, 407
 —Films for children, 412
 Five-Year Plan, 23, 34, 41, 43, 44, 65, 67,
 77, 91, 111, 146, 236, 422, 446, 475
 —Five-Year Plan, First, 11, 17, 18, 48, 57,
 68, 70, 72, 82, 91, 93, 94
 —Five-Year Plan, Second, 17, 18, 20, 21,
 43, 48, 51, 57, 74, 82, 84, 86, 88, 90-106,
 107, 153, 182, 184, 235, 422, 423
 —Five-Year Plan, Third, 82, 94, 423
 Flood Control, 121-122
 Floods, 167, 168
 Food Production, 95, 99, 101
 Foreign Capital, Compulsory Acquisition
 of, 131
 Foreign Exchange, 100, 101, 103
 Foreign Policy, 49, 177, 178, 228, 280, 281,
 283-5, 517
 Formosa, 241, 299
 France, 74, 255, 281, 329, 330, 357, 507
 —French Culture, 463, 464
 —French Government, 462, 463
 —French (language), 28, 397, 422, 463,
 464
 —French Revolution, 137, 139
 —French Settlements in India, 376, 381
 Freedom, 152, 153, 174, 310, 345, 359, 446,
 454, 464, 501-3
 Freedom of individual, 53, 78
 Freedom, national, 49, 50, 78, 88, 108, 109,
 143
 Fuel Research Institute, 259
 Fundamental Rights, 127, 455

G

Gadgil, D. R., 68, 76, 80
 Gadgil, N. V., 150, 357, 397
 Gandak, 121

Gandhi, Mahatma, 23, 24, 25, 31, 32, 34,
35, 47, 134, 154, 219, 220, 229, 302, 307,
326, 373, 382, 384, 431, 442, 462, 473,
478, 481, 482, 487-9, 503
Gangetic Valley, 277
Geneva Conference, 265, 282, 283
Genocide, 220
German (language), 28, 397, 422
Germany, 74, 274, 328, 338, 368, 378, 388,
392, 483
Ghana, 340-342
Ghosh, J. C., 70
Gilgit, 233, 237, 238
Gita, 487
Glimpses of World History, 474
Goa and NATO, 269
Goa Problem, 178, 362, 372-392
Gold Coast, 316
Greece, 505
Greeks, 32
Guidallo, Rani, 493
Gujarat, 186, 207
Gujarati (language), 394
Gujaratis, 180, 195, 204
Gurmukhi, 174, 181
Gurupadaswamy, M. S., 312

H

Haffkine Institute, 486
Handicrafts, 51
Haralu, Dr, 494
Haroun Al-Raschid, 484
Hartal, 189, 190, 336
Heavy Industry, 11, 42, 51, 52, 70, 71, 86,
88
Heavy Water, 260
Himalayas, 3, 32, 65, 204, 205, 415
Hindi, 27, 30, 174, 181, 203, 397, 398, 422-
425
Hindi and All-India Services, 29
Hindi as regional and all-India language,
394 to 396
Hindu Code Bill, 440, 451
Hindu Law, 440, 441, 446
—, Hindu Marriage Bill, 446-454
—, Special Marriage Bill, 440, 442
Hindu law reform, 361
—, Sir B. N., Rau's Committee, 447, 453
Hindu Society, 440-442, 443, 444, 448,
449-454
Hinduism, 165
Hindus, 181, 182, 186, 234, 443, 446, 450

Hirakud, 2, 121, 353, 432
Hitler, 368, 369
Holy alliance, idea of, 508-510
Horror Comics, 408, 409
Horthy, Admiral, 327
Human Rights, 295, 298
Humility, 432-434
Hungary, 49, 321-340, 364, 501
—History, 326, 327
—U.N. resolution on, 333, 334
Hunger-strikes, 30
Huns, 32, 415
Hydari, Sir Akbar, 496
Hyderabad, 179
Hydrogen bomb, 39, 77, 184, 246-250, 343,
501

I

Imperial Bank, 132
India House, 486
Indian Administrative Service, 149
Indian Army, 219, 222
Indian Civil Service, 149
Indian Civilization, 32, 33, 47, 460
Indian Culture, 33, 34, 38, 413, 418, 449,
450, 464
Indian Institute of Public Administration,
158
Indian National Congress, 12, 15, 35, 134,
152, 153, 154, 395, 487
Indian Republic, 46, 155
Indian Republic and Commonwealth, 341
Indian Statistical Institute, 74, 107
Indians abroad and Commonwealth, 316
Indians in South Africa, 295
Indo-Ceylonese Agreement, 365
Indo-China, 245-246, 251, 252, 265, 266,
271, 282, 283, 299, 388, 392
Indonesia, 72, 271, 278, 283, 285, 286, 292,
293, 390
Indore, 51
Indus, 3
Indus Valley Civilization, 32
Industrial development, 51, 88
Industrial Policy, 14
Industrial Policy Resolution of 1948, 80,
102
Industrial Production, 9, 10, 11, 13
Industrial Revolution, 59, 60, 85, 130, 139,
468
Industrialization, 11, 26, 41, 42, 52, 53, 57,
61, 62, 63, 77, 78, 87, 88, 102, 109, 133,
422, 423, 446, 449

Industry—Centralization & decentralization, 78, 79, 89, 466-7
 Inflation, 19, 71
 Integral Coach Factory, Perambur, 23
 International Affairs, 44-46, 65, 77, 215, 272, 283, 284, 444
International Affairs (Periodical), 164
 International Court, 348
 International Law, 254, 508-512
 International Union of Official Travel Organizations, 468, 472
 Inter-University Youth Festival, 472
 Iron & Steel, 68, 72, 88, 104, 105, 259
 Israel, 323
 Iyengar, N. Gopalaswamy, 26

J

Jaipal Singh, 125, 493-4, 498-9
 Jammu, 211
 Jamuna, 167, 169
 Japan, 9, 40, 61, 74, 87
 Jekyll and Hyde, 442
 Judiciary, 66
 Jullundur, 167
 Junagadh, 220

K

Kadar, Janos, 336
 Kailash (Mount), 3
 Kalelkar, Kaka, 459
 Kalimpong, 215
 Kamath, H. V., 219, 314, 333, 491, 493, 494
 Kannada (language), 27, 28
 Karaikal, 463
 Kashmir, 178, 213, 215, 209, 239, 345, 361, 362, 364, 365, 382, 420
 —Constituent Assembly, 222, 223, 224, 231, 232
 —Constitution, 231
 —Basic facts, 216-226
 —National Conference, 211, 214
 —In Security Council, 236
 —U.N. Observers, 226
 —U.N. Commission, 221, 234
 Kathiawar, 220
 Keishing, Reishang, 493-495
 Kerala, 517
 Kerala and S.R.C. Report, 191, 192
 Khan, Sir Zafrullah, *See* Z
 Khongmen, Mrs., 458
 Khosla, J. N., 334, 335, 336

Khrushchev, Nikita, 308
 Kinsey Report, 448
 Kohima, 493
 Korea, 240, 243, 265
 Korea and India, 244-245
 Korean War, 270
 Kosi, 121
 Kosi Project, 73, 74
 Kripalani, Acharya, 382
 Krishnamachari, T. T., 228
 Krishnamachari, V. T., 82
 Krishna Menon, *See* Menon
 Krishnan, K. S., 506, 508
 Kun, Bela, 326
 Kunzru, H. N., 206, 334, 337, 339, 340
 Kutch, 186

L

Labour, 65, 66
 Ladakh, 32,
 Laissez faire, 13, 59
 Land Legislation, 13
 Language, 27, 172, 173, 174, 175
 Language & S.R.C. Report, 172-176, 181, 193, 194, 203, 204
 Laos, 275, 282, 283, 299
 Latin, 397
 Latin America, 241
 Lenin, 302, 326
 Liaquat Ali Khan, 225
 Lincoln, Abraham, 46
 Lisbon, 389
 London, 299

M

Macao, 990
 Madhya Bharat, 192
 Madhya Pradesh, 179, 185
 Madhya Pradesh & S.R.C. Report, 192
 Madras, 458
 Madras & S.R.C. Report, 191, 192
 Madras City, 208
 Magadha, 432
 Mahabharata, 419, 421
 Mahalanobis, P. C., 68, 70, 74, 436
 Maharashtra & S.R.C. Report, 186, 198, 199, 201, 202, 204, 207
 Mahashtrians, 180, 181, 185, 186, 195, 204
 Mahatma Gandhi, *See* under G
 Malaya, 271, 317
 Malenkov, G. M., 248

Manchu Dynasty, 274
 Manchuria, 61
 Manila Conference, 265, 266
 Manila Treaty, 266, 267, 268
 Mansarovar, 3
 Manu, 443, 448, 450
 Manual labour, 403, 404, 406
 Mao Tse-tung, 53, 76
 Marco Polo, 469, 470
 Marathi (language), 394
 Market economy, 460
 Marriage, Special Marriage Bill, 440, 442
 —Marriage and Divorce, 443-445, 450
 Marx, Karl, 84
 Marxism, 276, 414
 Medical Services, 483-6
 Medium Industry, 86, 86
 Mehta, Asoka, 10, 286
 Menon, K.P.S., 334, 336
 Menon, V. K. Krishna, 227, 228, 234, 236, 299, 300, 333, 338, 339
 Meteorological Department, 122
 Middle East, 281, 329, 330
 Mikoyan, Anastas, 105
 Military aid, 38, 42, 43, 44
 Military Pacts, 43, 49, 281, 282, 283, 298, 310, 319, 320, 510
 Moghuls, 33
 Mohenjodaro, 32, 413
 Monazite sands, 261
 Money Bill, in Constitution, 115
 Monroe Doctrine, 380
 Moors, 378
 Morocco, 296, 392, 503
 Mountbatten, Lord and Lady, 477-480
Mrichchakatika, 443
 Mukherjee, H. N., 148, 313
 Muslim League, 234
 Muslim women's education, 401, 402
 Muslims, 213, 234
 Muzaffarabad, 233
 Mysore, 83, 185

N

Nagas, 490-499
 —Naga Hills, 490, 492, 494-5
 —Naga National Council, 496, 498
 Nalanda, 432, 433
 Naoroji, Dadabhai, 486, 489
 Narayan, Jayaprakash, 152, 153, 154
 National Council for Training in Vocational Trades, 106

National Development Council, 69, 76, 95, 103
 National Extension Service, 10, 21, 22, 25, 72, 100, 101
 National income, 17, 68, 69, 74, 93, 94, 97
 Nationalization, 12, 80, 102, 132
 NATO, *see* North Atlantic Treaty Organization,
 NEFA, *see* North-East Frontier Agency
 Nekowal border incident, 355
 Nehru, Motilal 480-483
 Neutralism, 509-510
 Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission, 243
 New Delhi, 116, 471
 New Zealand, 266, 291, 300
 Newspapers, 410, 455, 456, 457
 Nkrumah, Kwame, 341, 342
 Non-violence, 382, 417
 North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 268, 269, 328, 331, 338, 339, 378
 North-East Frontier Agency, 32, 490, 497
 North Pole, 386
 North-West Frontier Province, 220
 Norway, 74
 Nu, U 493-494
 Nuclear energy, *see* Atomic energy

O

Office organization, 116, 124
 Oil, 42, 103
 One World, 424, 469
 Organization & Methods Division, 145
 Orissa, 180
 Orissa and S.R.C. Report, 191
 Ottawa, 299

P

Pahlavi, 415
 Pakistan, 3, 87, 153, 209, 213, 215, 217, 218, 220-38, 292, 319, 320, 354, 357, 360, 361, 362, 368, 478
 —Army of Pakistan, 218, 219, 222, 224, 229
 —Canal Waters Dispute, 346-354
 —Foreign Interference, 236-239
 —Indo-Pakistan Relations—Border incidents, 226, 355
 —No War Declaration, 225, 226, 356
 —Press of Pakistan, 213, 214, 354
 —Two-nation theory, 234, 364, 365
 —U.S. aid to, 223, 232, 233, 237, 344-346

Palestine, 295
 Panchayat, 162, 163
 Panchsheel, 177, 184, 187, 253, 262, 283,
 284, 297, 303, 306-308, 356, 502, 512
 Pant-Mirza Agreement, 355
 Parliament of India, 113-114, 156, 158
 196, 358, 484, 486, 489
 Parliamentary democracy, 8, 11, 137-144,
 155-158, 276, 278, 279, 284
 Passports and Visas, 470
 Pataskar H. V., 448
 Peace, 49, 50, 110, 184, 219, 251-53, 263,
 265-68, 271, 273, 283, 298, 303, 304,
 309-12, 317, 320, 342-54, 417, 427, 500,
 501, 503
 Peaceful coexistence, 253, 286, 318, 502,
 512
 Pearson, Lester, 248
 Peking, 253, 300
 People's Democracy, 276
 People's Republic of China, *see* China
 PEPSU, 2, 167, 352
 Perambur, 23
 Persian (language), 28
 Phizo, 492, 493, 495, 497
 Plan Frame, 68, 69, 74
 Planck, Max, 254
 Planning, 4, 5, 17, 18, 20, 21, 48, 51, 61,
 67, 68, 70, 74, 76-77, 81, 88, 89, 91, 93,
 98, 99, 117, 132, 165
 Planning Commission, 10, 15, 61, 68, 69, 70,
 74, 75, 82, 83, 84, 90, 94, 95, 107, 402
 Plebiscite, 195, 200
 Plebiscite in Kashmir, 222, 230, 231, 232,
 233, 234, 235
 Poland, 74, 327, 328
 Pondicherry, 461-464
 Poona, 420, 421
 Population, 69, 96, 97
 Port Said, 321, 322, 324, 327
 Portugal, 376, 377, 378, 384, 389
 —Treaties with England, 378, 379
 —Portuguese Settlements in India, 378,
 381
 Power Vacuum Theory, 342-344
 Praja Socialist Party, 134, 135, 152, 154
 Press, Freedom of, 454-458
 Prime Minister, 201, 202
 Private enterprise, 13, 70, 79, 80, 98
 Private Property, acquisition of, 125-134
 Provincialism, 35, 37, 54, 154, 202
 Public enterprise, 105, 106
 Public Sector and Private Sector, 12-14,
 62, 79, 82, 101-104, 132-133

Punjab, 2, 87, 174, 182, 220, 458
 Punjab and S.R.C. Report, 178, 179, 180,
 181, 182, 185, 186
 Punjabi (language), 174, 181

Q

Quantum theory, 254

R

Racial discrimination, 310
 Raghu Vira, 396, 397
 Rajasthan, 2, 352
 Rajputs, 415
 Ramachandra, 451
 Red Fort, 387
 Relativity, Theory of, 254
 Reorganization of States, *see* States
 Republic Day, 184
 River Valley Projects, 71, 121
 —Co-ordination Board of Ministers, 4
 Roy, B. C., 191, 193
 Rural industrialization, 83
 Russia, 9, 16, 17, 40, 45, 53, 61, 72, 74,
 76, 77, 87, 94, 105, 131, 136, 137, 147,
 148, 151, 165, 184, 246, 259, 262, 264,
 274, 276, 277, 281, 291, 296, 311, 319,
 321, 326, 327, 328, 330, 331, 342, 343,
 423, 449, 507
 —Russia and Middle East, 329, 330
 —Russian language, 28, 422
 —Russian Revolution, 137, 302, 326
 —Twentieth Congress of the Communist
 Party, 318
 —Visit to, 301-306

S

Saha, Meghnad, 10, 257, 258, 259, 261
 Sahitya Akademi, 30, 173, 409
 Saiyidain, K. G., 480-483
 Salazar, 392
Sanskriti Ke Char Adhyaya, 412
 San Francisco, 305
 Sanskrit drama, 33
 Sanskrit (language), 27, 34, 174, 397,
 415, 418-421
 Satyagraha, 390, 391, 392
 Satyagraha in Goa, 382, 383, 384, 386,
 387, 388, 390, 392
 Satyavan, 451
 Saurashtra, 186, 447, 453
 Sevitra, 451

Scheduled Castes, 459
 School of African Studies, Delhi, 341
 Science, 34, 81, 93, 95, 98, 164, 165, 166, 303, 432-434, 468
 Science and truth, 432-434, 485, 505
 Science Congress, Calcutta, 432
 Scythians, 32, 415
 SEATO, 223, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 319, 320, 328, 331, 338, 363, 364
 Secular State, 213, 455
 Security Council, 219, 220, 221, 227, 230, 231, 232, 234, 256, 270, 298, 361, 362
 Serbian language, 394
 Services, Gradation of, 119-120
 Shantiparva, 419, 421
 Sharda Script, 420
 Sikhs, 181, 182, 186
 Sindri Fertilizer Factory, 11, 353
 Singapore, 275, 317, 407
 Singh, Ghansara, 237
 Singh, Jaipal, *see* under J
 Sinha, Srikrishna, 193
 Sita, 451
 Slums, 466-7
 Socialism, 12, 17, 52, 53, 76, 77, 82, 85, 96, 136, 148, 162, 359
 Socialist Party, 134, 135
 Socialist Pattern of Society, 12, 13, 15, 17, 23, 76, 85, 91, 96, 133, 303
 South Africa, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317
 South-East Asia, 266, 281, 363, 417
 South-East Asia Treaty Organization, *see* SEATO
 South India, 27, 29, 415, 416
 South India and Hindi, 29, 393, 395, 396
 Soviet Union, *see* Russia
 Spain, 378
 Spanish (language), 28, 422
 Speaker, Powers of, 114, 115
 Spirituality, 78, 426, 431, 473
 "Spoils System", 148, 149
 Srinagar, 210, 219
 States Reorganization, 36, 54, 55, 154
 States Reorganization Bill, 196-208
 States Reorganization Commission, 171
 States Reorganization Commission Report, 30, 168-195, 203
Sthitaprajna, 417
 Strikes, 65, 66, 110-112
 Subbarayan, P., 370
 Sudan, 503
 Suez Canal, 321
 Sukarno, Ahmed, 293

Supreme Court, 126, 127, 278
 Sutlej, 2, 3, 347, 352
 Swimming Pool Reactor, 504, 505, 507, 508, 517

T

Tagore, Rabindranath, 435, 436, 437, 438, 482
 Taiwan, 392
 Takshasila, 484
 Tamil (language), 28, 396
 Tamil Nad, 204
 Tamilians, 204
 Tandon, Purshottamdas, 391
 Tatas, 259
 Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, 513, 517
 Taxation, 63, 69, 75
 Technology, 39, 40, 48, 59, 77, 93, 95, 97-98, 108-109, 164, 165, 166, 174, 303, 423-25, 433, 439
 Telangana, 179
 Telugu language, 28
 Thailand, 271, 273
 Thinking, the art of, 475
 Thought and Words, 419, 320
 Tibet, 3, 253, 262, 263, 278
 Tilak, Lokmanya Bal Gangadhar, 412, 486-489
 Tirap Frontier Division, 493, 498
 Tools, Meaning and importance, 106-107
 Tourism, 468-472
 Town-planning, 465-7
 Trade Unions, 65, 66, 110
 Travancore-Cochin, 38, 261
 Travel, *see* Tourism
 Tribal Affairs Conference, New Delhi, 458
 Tribal people, 458-61
 Trichur, 36, 134
 Trombay, 261, 504
 Tuensang, 491, 492, 495, 498
 Tungabhadra, 121
 Tunisia, 296, 503
 Turhan, 33
 Turkey, 152, 344
 Turks, 32
 Tyabji, Saif, 516

U

Unani, 484-485
 Unemployment, *see* Employment and Unemployment

UNESCO, 499-504
 United Kingdom, 156, 281, 314, 315, 329,
 330, 342, 364, 376, 507
 United Nations, 209, 219, 222, 243, 244,
 248, 255, 256, 270, 271, 289, 296, 300,
 305, 321, 328, 348, 361, 500, 509
 —United Nations Charter, 50, 268, 298,
 305, 361, 500, 501
 —U. N. General Assembly, 248, 249, 250,
 500
 United States, 7, 16, 17, 45-50, 62, 72, 74,
 74, 77, 84, 87, 108, 136, 145, 147, 148,
 151, 165, 246, 255, 256, 259, 261, 262,
 264, 276, 277, 281, 284, 290, 291, 299,
 306, 320, 330, 342, 343, 344, 364, 380,
 449, 483, 495, 503, 507, 516
 Unity of India, 32, 36-38, 54, 187, 193,
 205, 418, 464
 Untouchability, 86, 415, 442, 453
 Urdu language, 174, 181
 Uri, 219

V

Vasan, S. S. 408
 Vedas, 487
 Vidarbha, 186, 192
 Viet-Nam, 299
 Village Industry, 19, 23, 24, 51, 71
 Violence, 178, 187, 188, 189, 190, 195,
 287, 310, 329, 332, 333, 428, 429, 431,
 434, 436
 Visva Bharati, Santiniketan, 435, 437-39
 Viswesvaraya, M, 83

W

Walls, dislike of, 25

War, 39, 41, 42, 50, 77, 92, 130, 184, 219,
 229, 248, 253, 273, 281, 282, 283, 303,
 304, 309, 310, 336, 337, 344, 345, 362,
 382, 383, 444, 462, 500-2, 506, 509,
 510, 513
 Warsaw Treaty, 328, 330, 331, 335, 338,
 363
 Washington, 46, 299, 350
 Wazir Committee, 211
 Welfare State, 17, 18, 359
 Welfare State and Socialistic pattern —
 Not synonymous, 17
 West Bengal, 180
 West Irian, 296
 West Pakistan, 224
 West Pakistan Constitution, 360
 West Punjab, 346, 347, 348
 Western Asia, 33, 319, 343
 Western Europe, 165
 Women of India, 444, 445, 447, 451-3
 Women's Education, 398, 402
 Work and Status, 399, 400
 World Bank, 349, 350, 351
 World War, First, 278, 326, 379, 470
 World War, Second, 263, 278, 358, 500

Y

Yajnavalkya, 448, 450
 Yugoslavia, 16, 17, 283, 303
 —, Languages in, 394
 Youth, 472-476

Z

Zafrullah Khan, Sir M., 350
 Zamindari System, 131
 Zonal Councils, 183, 186, 187

